THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION

Volume XII JUNE, 1926 Number 3

HIPPIAS AND A LOST CANON OF RHETORIC

BROMLEY SMITH
Johns Hopkins University

WHEN Thomas Wilson set forth in English *The Art of Rhetorique,* in 1553, he informed the student that whosoever "will largely handle any matter, must fasten his mynde first of all, upon these five especial pointes that followe, and learne them every one: I. Invention of matter. II. Disposition of the same. III. Elocution. IV. Memorie. V. Utteraunce." These canons of rhetoric he borrowed directly from the old masters of the subject. He never dreamed that Memory and Utterance would soon disappear from the texts on rhetoric and that Elocution would lose its old connotation, which was that of diction or style, and assume the function of the old Roman *Pronuntiatio,* meaning Delivery or Utterance. Wilson may have had a faint premonition of their future, for he devoted only nine pages to Memory and four to Utterance. In dealing with the fourth canon, interesting as to content and history, the student of public speaking is invited to pursue an *ignis fatuus* across a pedagogic bog, during which he might as well become acquainted with a renowned rhetorician who first taught the technique of this forgotten phase of rhetoric.

Suppose we lose consciousness for a moment and then awake on the banks of the Alpheus at a great Olympic festival. Bewildered, we become part of a throng that is sometimes thrilling over athletic contests, and at other times is listening with keen attention to exhibitions of skill in music, dramatic art, poetry, and even

oratory. One of the contestants is a handsome fellow, clad in purple, who casually asks the audience to name the subject on which he should speak. A subject being called out, he begins immediately to charm the audience by delivering in good form an ornate and thoughtful address.[1]

We must draw nearer to this daring orator, letting Socrates introduce us to him. "I know," said he, "that in most arts you, O Hippias, are the wisest of men. . . . . Upon one occasion, when you went to the Olympic games, all that you had on your person was made by yourself. You began with your ring, which was of your own workmanship, and you said that you could engrave rings; and you had another seal which was also of your own workmanship, and a scraper (flesh-brush) and an oil flask, which you had made yourself; you said also that you had made the shoes which you had on your feet, and the cloak and short tunic; but what appeared to us all most extra-ordinary and a proof of singular art, was the girdle of your tunic, which you said, was as fine as the most costly Persian fabric, and of your own weaving."[2] Here then was an independent man, the original Jack-of-all-Trades, one whom the Greeks called *αὐτάρκης*, the self-sufficient.

This versatility in handicraft was, however, only the outward sign of universal inner attainments. Hippias of Elis happened to be one of those rare freaks of the mental world, a polymath. Like Isidore of Seville, Albertus Magnus, Francis Bacon, and Giovanni Mirandola,[3] he claimed all knowledge for his province. When one glances through the list of subjects with which he was familiar, gradually the notion arises that Hippias of Elis was a general-specialist, the founder of the liberal arts course. Cicero noted this when he observed that "the ancient masters and authors of the art of speaking considered no subject of disputation to be foreign to their profession, but were always exercising themselves in every branch of oratory. Of which number was Hippias of Elis who boasted in the hearing of almost all Greece that there was no subject in any art or science of which he was ignorant; as he un-

[1]Plato, *Hipp. Maj.* 281 A. Ael., *Var. Hist.* xii. 32. Phil., *Vit. Soph.* 496. Plato, *Hipp. Min.* 363.

[2]Plato, *Hipp. Min.* 368. Cic., *de Or.* III. 32.

[3]This was the famous character who challenged the world of his day to dispute with him on any one of 900 theses.

derstood those arts in which all liberal and polite learning is comprised—geometry, music, grammar, and poetry; and whatever is said on the nature of things, the moral duties of men, and the science of government."[4] Likewise Plato had observed the all-around ability of the man, for he relates the Socrates "lifted up his eyes and saw" Hippias the Elean sitting on a chair of state in the house of Callias. Around him were his pupils and followers, putting to him "certain physical and astronomical questions, which he *ex cathedra* was determining to them and discoursing of them."[5] Other subjects may have been under discussion; for Protagoras in the conversation with Socrates presently looked toward Hippias as he mentioned some teachers who made their pupils learn arithmetic, astronomy, geometry, and music.[6] A glance over these subjects shows that Hippias was familiar with the whole quadrivium.

Passing on to the trivium we soon note the interest of the Elean in grammar. Using this term in the broad sense in his day —for it included not only technical grammar, but also literary interpretation—we discover him lecturing on rhythms and harmony, on letters and syllables. He would even rise from the professor's chair to demonstrate his own skill; for, in addition to speeches, he composed poems—epic, tragic, and dithryambic.[7] Here then was the beginning of that keen observation of order and choice in the use of letters and syllables which lead to the literary criticisms of Dionysius, Demetrius, and Longinus. What did Hippias discover and teach about rhythms and harmonies in speech and poetry? Alas, we do not know.

Between grammar and dialectic, the second subject in the trivium, there is a ravine which few have bridged successfully. Hippias seems to have been able to teach literature and also to conduct an argument. The net result of Hippias' discussion, however, favors rhetoric, for he regarded dialectic as the slices, the parings of reason, because he much preferred to make complete

[4]Cic., *de Or.* III. 32.. Quint.,*Inst. Orat* XII. 11.21. Xenoph.,*Mem.* IV. 4. Hippias is called Πολυμαθής.

[5]Plato, *Prot.* 315.

[6]*Prot.* 318. *Hipp. Maj.* 285; Phil., *V. Soph.* I. 11; *Hipp. Min.* 366, 367. Cic., *de Or.* III. 32 furnish additional evidence on the quadrivium.

[7]*Hipp. Min.* 368. *Hipp. Maj.* 285. Phil., *V. Soph.* I. 11.

addresses.[8] In this respect he resembled the other Sophists with whom Socrates attempted to argue.

If the Elean was not an expert in dialectics, when hampered by the pen of Plato, he was at least master in the field of rhetoric. In this division of the trivium he won the applause of the crowd and a place in Plato's gallery of rhetoricians. There he is hung in company with Protagoras, Gorgias, Prodicus, Thrasymachus, and others. Why, it would be difficult to say. Ostensibly he had offended the philosopher, because he, like the others, took pay for his lectures. Perhaps Plato's aristocratic blood was disturbed by the anomaly of ambassadors earning their living as instructors of youth.[9] Why should these outsiders come to Athens as representatives of their states, make telling addresses before the assemblies, and then travel about the country delivering lectures and teaching public speaking for fees? It made no difference, apparently, if they did put their rhetorical ability into practice by publications as well as by addresses. Hippias, for instance, could not win his respect even though he was credited, according to Suidas, with many writings. Among these were an elegy on the Messenian boys' choir lost at sea while on their way to a festival, a collection of exempla, a work on the Olympic victors, historical treatises, poems, and several pieces of an epideictic character.[10]

In these productions the ambassador from Elis revealed his knowledge of rhetoric. He thought that they ought to be "neither long nor short, but of a convenient length."[11] Further, he applied his study of syllables, rhythms, and harmonies; so that, as Philostratus says, his style was pleasing. It was "never meagre, but copious and natural, with few appeals to the vocabulary of the poets." In fact his style was so pleasing that it was imitated in good earnest by Proclus of Naucratis. This latter rhetorician "rarely delivered a formal prooemium, but whenever he did embark on such an address, Hippias and Gorgias were the men whom

[8] *Hipp. Maj.* 304. Schol. in *Gorg.* 353. 44.

[9] Protagoras came from Abdera, Gorgias from Leontinum, Prodicus from Ceos, Hippias from Elis, Thrasymachus from Chalcedon. See *Hipp. Maj.* 282 for an account of the large fees which Hippias received.

[10] Suidas. ἔγραψε πολλά. Pausanias V. 25.4; Clem. *Strom.* VI. 15; Plut., *Num. Pomp.* 1.; *Hipp. Maj.* 286A; Phil., *V. Soph.* 1. 11; Scholia of *Apol. Rhod.* III. 1179.

[11] *Phaedrus*, 267.

he resembled.'"[12] When he attempted to teach the youth his effects in style, he gave them common-places of an emotional character, like his own Trojan discourse; for the students could wax eloquent over the heroes of the Iliad and the grandeur of Greece.[13]

Nevertheless, in spite of the good reception accorded Hippias at Olympia and Athens, in spite of the literary merits of his works, Plato could not resist the impulse to ridicule his style and diplomacy. A deadlock between Socrates and Protagoras must be broken; whereupon Hippias steps in to separate the dialecticians. Holding them apart, he appeals to the assembled company:

"All of you who are here present I reckon to be kinsmen and friends and fellow citizens, by nature and not by law; for by nature like is akin to like, whereas law is the tyrant of mankind, and often compels us to do many things which are against nature. How great would be the disgrace then, if we, who know the nature of things, and are the wisest of the Hellenes, and who, bearing such a high character, are met together in this city, which is the metropolis of wisdom, and in the greatest and most glorious house of this city, should have nothing to show worthy of this height of dignity, but should only quarrel with one another like the meanest of mankind! I do pray and advise you, Protagoras, and you, Socrates, to agree upon a compromise. Let us be your peacemakers. And do not you, Socrates, aim at this precise and extreme brevity in discourse, if Protagoras objects, but loosen and let go the reins of speech, that your words may be grander and more becoming to you. Neither do you, Protagoras, go forth on the gale with every sail set out of sight of land into an ocean of words, but let there be a mean observed by both of you. Do as I say. And let me also persuade you to choose an arbiter or overseer or president; he will keep watch over your words and will prescribe their proper length."[14]

This rather sententious appeal opens the way for a renewal of the dialectic battle. The imitation of Hippias' style, however, hardly gives the same impression as does an extract from one of his works, given by Clement. Discoursing on plagiarism of expressions and dogmas among the Greeks Clement adduces the express testimony of Hippias the Sophist of Elea, thus:

"Of these things some perchance will be said by Orpheus, some briefly by Musaeus; some in one place, others in other places; some by Hesiod, some by Homer, some by the rest of the poets; and some in prose compositions, some by Greeks, some by Barbarians. And I from all

[12]Phil., *Vit. Soph.* II. 21. See also *Hipp. Maj.* 286A.
[13]Quint., *Inst. Or.* III. 1. 12.
[14]*Protagoras*, 337

these, placing together the things of most importance and of kindred character, will make the discourse new and varied."[15]

Therein would seem to be the oratorical repetitions, the short clauses, the allusions to literature, which might be expected of a man accustomed to public speaking. So much for Hippias the rhetorician, dialectician, and grammarian.

Naturally we might think that the trivium and quadrivium would fully employ one teacher. It would an ordinary teacher; but Hippias was not an ordinary teacher; he was a pantologist. Accordingly, noting the interest of the Greeks in art, he lectured on painting and sculpture and music.[16] In addition he had ideas on history and statecraft, philosophy and ethics. From Plutarch we learn that he was able to give in detail the Olympic victors and that he was acquainted with Spartan history; from Athenæus that he had collected historical data, such as the account of Thargelia the Milesian, a lady so beautiful that she had fourteen husbands; from Clement that he was familiar with mythology; from Philostratus that he discussed government at home and colonial policies; and from Plato that he lectured on nations, heroes, customs, and the founding of cities. Thus we perceive a most remarkable case of an all-round man, able with hand as well as mind, master of manual and mental discipline, founder of the liberal arts course, a one-man university.[17]

A moment ago, in the Platonian imitation, Hippias was made to speak of nature and law, to say that "law is the tyrant of mankind which often compels us to do many things against nature."[18] This attitude toward law, corroborated and amplified by Xenophon in the *Memorabilia* (IV. 4, 19) has given Hippias a place among the philosophers. In the amplification Hippias could see no reason why men should be obligated to obey man-made laws. Of course, such an opinion set him in the front rank of the free-thinkers. Inasmuch as the connection of his anarchical, individualistic philosophy with rhetoric has never been explained, we must follow Hippias for a moment into some shady grove, where

[15]Clem., *Strom.* VI. 15.

[16]Phil. *V. Soph.* 1. 11. Cic., *de Or.* III. 32.

[17]Plut., *Numa Pomp.* 1; Athen. XIII. 608 F; Clem., *Strom.*, VI. 15; Plut., *Lycurg.* 23; Phil., *V. Soph.* I. 11; *Hipp. Maj.* 285 B.

[18]*Prot.* 337 C.

his pupils assemble about him. We find that he questions the current ideas of his day, even as Protagoras, Gorgias, and Socrates questioned them.[19] Does Zeus exist and rule the universe? If he exists and rules, what laws does he make? Please define natural law. What do you mean by artificial or positive law? If then, some laws are made by men, are they uniform in the various nations? Do they change even in the same state according to the whim of the ruling class or of the people? If there is such diversity and such instability in these man-made laws, is it a duty to respect and obey them? Are not men of culture estranged by political views which become by enactment laws? Should a citizen be morally obligated to obey laws made by the opposition, laws subject to modification or even abrogation? Hippias admitted that a divine or natural law should be observed, but he contended that man-made law was tyrannous, that it compelled humanity to do that which is contrary to nature.

To this questioning of current notions must be added his own experiences as an ambassador and traveller to Sicily, Italy, Sparta, and Athens; and his reading of history, archaeology, mythology, and literature. From such sources he obtained material which showed plainly the ups and downs of politics, the variations in the decisions of courts, the changes in the will of the people. Armed with such material he would aid his pupils in the preparation of their common-places and arguments.

Did he turn out anarchists? No impeachment of him is discoverable. He was not arrested like Socrates for corrupting youth. His books were not burned in the market-place like those of Protagoras. Both Plato and Xenophon display him as a law-abiding, respected citizen, sympathetic with justice and uprightness, holding the "frank and straight-forward" Achilles superior to the "wily and false" Odysseus, and teaching his pupils honorable pursuits.[20] To their testimony must be added that of Philostratus who states that "on behalf of Elis he went on more embassies than any other Greek, and in no case did he fail to maintain his reputation, whether while making public speeches or lecturing, and at the same time he amassed great wealth and was enrolled in the tribes of

[19]Q. J. S. E. March, 1918. Protagoras, The Father of Debate. Q. J. S. E. Nov., 1921. Gorgias: A Study of Oratorical Style.

[20]Xen., *Mem.* IV. 4. 5. *Hipp. Maj.* 268A. *Hipp. Min.* 365B.

cities both great and small."[21] Nevertheless, in spite of the high esteem in which Hippias was held, or perhaps because of it, as well as because he took pay for his lessons, Plato put him in his gallery of rogues.[22] Perhaps Plato sensed the implications of Hippias' philosophy and recoiled from them. Would not the denial of the moral obligation to obey the laws mean self-determination for the individual? Would not self-determination involve the power of each individual to judge for himself what was right and wrong? If each determined for himself right and wrong, how could any standards exist? If each man was his own judge, then all men were equal; there would be no bond or free. Of course, such a society was impossible from the point of view of a sage who believed the world should be run by philosophers.[23] Accordingly, Hippias is denied the title of philosopher; that is, lover of wisdom; and is dubbed instead sarcastically "a wise man."[24]

A question may naturally arise as to whether any single human being could possibly give instruction on so wide a range of subjects, from arithmetic to philosophy, instruction at least that would be profitable to students. In answering the quesion one must bear in mind that the sciences in the fifth century B. C. were in their infancy. Many of the present day sciences did not exist. All the facts about astronomy, physics, meteorology and even physiology could be learned in a few months. Lectures on such subjects were padded with conjectures and hypotheses. Again, the whole of arithmetic and geometry could easily be absorbed in a short time. Plato was leading philosophy into the maze from which it has never emerged. All that was valuable in history, law, and literature could be read in a few years. From all this it follows that Hippias was doing in his day what many teachers of rhetoric have since attempted to do: feeling the connection of rhetoric with other branches of knowledge, the dependence of the orator upon history, economics, and philosophy for material upon which to apply the principles of public speaking; many of them have rebelled

[21]See also *Hipp. Maj.* 281A. where his embassies to Lacedemon and other places are mentioned.

[22]Plato, *Apology* 19 E., *Hipp. Maj.* 282.

[23]See Plato's *Republic*.

[24]*Hipp. Maj.* 281.

against specialization and have become perforce general-specialists.[25]

To be a general-specialist even in the infancy of learning would require among other things a powerful memory. Now Hippias possessed such extraordinary powers of retention that in his old age, after hearing fifty names only once, he could repeat them in the order in which he heard them.[26] He himself believed that this ability could be taught, for he gave lessons in the art of memory, in which he took especial delight.[27] The success of these lessons is reflected humorously by Xenophon who causes Socrates to twit Callias with remembering, as a result of some lessons from Hippias, all the pretty girls he has met. Whether other pupils were as successful in their efforts as Callias, we are not informed. We do learn, however, a fact of importance in the history of speech; namely, that in the fifth century B. C. a rhetorician was already giving lessons in the art of strengthening the memory. As a result of Hippias' labors there came a day when memory joined with invention, arrangement, diction, and delivery, in becoming the fundamental subjects of an orator's education.

Suppose we inquire more minutely into the status of memory as a part of rhetoric. Very soon we discover that some authorities ascribed the invention of a system of memory-training to Simonides of Ceos, (556-468 B. C.), a poet famous for his lyric poems and funeral odes. An interesting story is connected with the invention, to the effect that, when the roof of a banquet-hall fell upon the guests, Simonides, who had left the room a moment before, was able to identify the crushed bodies, because he remembered where the living banqueters had been seated.[28] From this tragic incident he is said to have noted that *order* gives distinction to memory, that those who wish to recall events or words should arrange places and symbols upon which to fasten the ideas.[29] This done, the places and the symbols would recall the ideas in their proper order. Yet Cicero, who relates the story, is not sure that

[25]See Quintilian, especially Book X; also article in Q. J. Pub Speak. 2:253, by E. L. Hunt on *General Specialists.*

[26]Phil. *V. Soph.* 1. 11. *Hipp. Maj.* 285.

[27]Xenoph. *Symp.* 4. 62. *Hipp. Maj.* 285. *Hipp. Min.* 268 B.

[28]Quint. XI. 2. 11. Simonides. Cic., *de Or.* II. 86.

[29]Cic. *de Or.* II. 86.

Simonides was actually the inventor of such a system, for he writes: "When Simonides, or someone else, offered to teach Themistocles his art of memory, that statesman replied that he would prefer to be taught the art of forgetfulness."[30] Again, in his treatise on Oratory he expresses a doubt concerning the inventor, when, in discussing the value of a good memory to an orator, he says that "Simonides, or whoever else invented the art, wisely saw, that those things are the most strongly fixed in our minds, which are communicated to them, and imprinted upon them, by the senses."[31] There being then some uncertainty as to the priority of the discovery of mnemonics, perhaps the best thing to do in the circumstances is to regard Simonides as the discoverer and Hippias as the practical promoter, the man who first considered the training of the memory an essential discipline in the education of an orator.

That the subject was considered very important may be known from the serious treatment it eventually received at the hands of rhetoricians—eventually, because it did not become embedded in the canons for sometime after Hippias had paved the way. Neither the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* nor the *Rhetoric of Aristotle* mention it, although Aristotle was acquainted with mnemonics.[32]. Sometime before the Christian era it must have been adopted, for the *Auctor ad Herennium* without question regards memory as one of the parts of oratory.[33] A few years later Cicero, in his *Oratorical Partitions* calls memory the guardian of invention, arrangement, voice and delivery.[34] His opinion of its place was not changed when he published in his fifty-second year at the request of his brother Quintus the *"De Oratore."* In this treatise he divides the art of the orator into five parts: "He ought to find out what he should say; next to arrange his matter in order with power and judgment; then to clothe his thoughts with language; further to get them by heart; and finally to deliver them with dignity and grace."[35]

The position of memory thus established was retained auto-

[30]Cic. *De Finibus.* II. 32. Cic. *Acad.* II. 1. 2. The same story is given.
[31]Cic. *de Orat.* II. 87.
[32]Arist. *de. mem.* 2., *Topics* VIII. 12. 8., *de an.* III. 3.
[33]*Auct. ad Heren.* 1. 2. 3.
[34]Cic. *de Part. Orat.* I. 3.
[35]Cic. *de Orat.* I. 31.

matically for centuries. Quintilian remarked that most authorities agreed on the five parts of oratory: invention, arrangement, expression, memory, and delivery or action.[36]. Subsequent authorities continued the canon traditionally. Fortunatianus, Victorinus, Julius Victor, Martianus Capella, Cassiodorus, Albinus, all agree with Quintilian and with Cicero that these five parts are indispensable.[37] When the tradition reached England, the mediæval rhetoricians, writing in Latin, merely echoed the earlier writers. As already pointed out in the introduction Wilson, writing in English, still retained memory in the canonical list. Then came a change of treatment. By the middle of the 18th century, the important rhetorical works of Blair, Campbell, and Kames had dropped memory. In the 19th century the texts of Whately, Hill, and Genung fail to notice the subject. Thus after two thousand years the principle taught by Hippias vanished from the art of public speaking.

Although Memory has vanished from present-day texts of rhetoric, it still persists as a subject of study under the heading of Mnemonics. An extensive literature has been developed by those who believe that they have discovered shortcuts to a strong memory.[38] The inventors of these often make extravagant claims concerning the value of their systems to public speakers and mankind in general. Few of them seem to be aware that the subject which they advertise in the magazines so alluringly was once a part of rhetoric and that the discoveries they claim are centuries old. These considerations naturally lead to an investigation of the connection of mnemonics with rhetoric.

Plainly, Hippias, as a practical teacher of rhetoric, must have realized the importance of a good memory, especially in a day when texts were few and costly, when instruction was given by the lecture method, when orators carried their speeches in their minds. He had probably noticed that some people possessed much better memories than others, he himself being blessed with extraordinary powers. As a trained thinker and scientist he would naturally be familiar with the theory of the ancients that memory

[36] *Inst. Orat.* III. 3. 1.

[37] Halm, *Rhetores Latini Minores:* Fortunat. 126ff; Victor. 178, 6; Julius Victor, Prooemium 17; Mart. Cap. 455, 8; Cassiod. 495, 16; Albinus, 526, 23.

[38] For a bibliography covering twenty-three pages see *Memory Systems*, by Middleton and Fellows, New York, 1888.

was a phenomenon of the mind like unto writing on waxen tablets.[39] If now the mind was like a tablet, might not a method be devised that would deepen the impressions? At this point he touched mnemonics. His system was apparently associated with names; for, as already stated, he could repeat fifty names in succession after hearing them once; he could recall the Olympic victors; he was well acquainted with the personalities of history, politics, and literature; and he had enabled his pupil to remember the beauties he had met. Further, we know that Hippias lectured on the arts. This could be done only by a man whose mind was filled with pictures of objects which he had seen in his travels—pictures of buildings, statues, and paintings. By fastening ideas upon these pictures or images, arranged in order, he would have a system such as that commonly devised by mnemonists and apparently used by rhetoricians. That such was the case can be inferred from the details given by Cornificius, Cicero, and Quintilian. These eminent rhetoricians borrowed the method from the Greeks, without mentioning the sources of their information.[40]

As the account given by Cornificius is the earliest Roman treatment of importance historically, we can learn from it directly the system which crystallized in the texts between the days of Hippias and Cicero. Passing over the natural memory which the author says can be improved "by inclination, by training, and by a sys-

[39]Plato, *Theaet.* 191. "Let us suppose that every man has in his mind a block of wax of various qualities, the gift of Memory, the mother of the Muses; and on this he receives the seal or stamp of those sensations and perceptions which he wishes to remember." *Philebus*, 38. The soul is like a book where memmory and perception write down words. Aristotle, *de Mem.* 1. 31. Memory is like the stamping of wax with seal-rings. Cicero, *Part. Orat.* VII. A perfect memory uses topics, as writing does wax, and on them arranges its images as if they were letters.

[40]The influence of the Greeks is acknowledged by Cornificius in III. 23. Quintilian freely quotes from Cicero, XI. 2. 22; while Cicero shows in his whole treatment his indebtedness to Greek sources. *De Orat.* II. 86-88. That mnemonic systems were known among the Greeks before the time of Aristotle may be learned from his own writings. In *De Anima* III. 3. 4. he writes: "We can represent an object before our eyes, as do those who range things under mnemonic headings and picture them to themselves." See also *De Insom* I. 458 b 17-20, where the τόποι μνημονικοί are the pigeon-holes in which images (εἴδωλα) associated with the facts to be remembered are supposed to be arranged.

tem of rules," we find that there is an artificial memory composed of places and images:

"We call those *places* which briefly, fully, strikingly, either by nature or by hand, are complete, so that we are able to understand and grasp them easily in our natural memory; as an altar, a space between columns, an angle, an arch, and other things which are like these. *Images* are certain forms, signs, likenesses of the thing which we wish to remember; for example, horses, lions, eagles; of which, if we desire to hold them in mind we must locate their images in certain places. . . . . It is necessary, if we wish to remember many things, to provide ourselves with many places, in order that we may be able to locate many images in many places . . . . We think it is better to arrange the places in order . . . . and it is a good idea to arrange them in fives. . . . . It is better to locate the places in a deserted region rather than a populous neighborhood, because the throng and the walking about of the people disturb and weaken the marks of the images. . . . . The places ought to be unlike in form and nature and plainly visible. . . . They should be of medium size . . . . not too well known nor exceedingly obscure. . . . . It is a good idea to put moderate intervals between the places. . . . . If anyone thinks he cannot find enough suitable places, he may create for himself as many as he wishes . . . . in his mind."

So much for the places.

As to the *images,* the author thinks they ought to be like the things and like the words. Resemblance to things is expressed by arranging images of the matters themselves, as a goblet in the right hand to indicate a murder by poison, tablet in the left hand to indicate the inheritance for which the crime was committed. A careful choice of the images will call up a memory of those things wished. If, on the other hand, we desire to recall words, we must set up images which will recall the words, as *Domitius* with his hand raised to heaven will bring back "Jam *domuitionem* reges" (Now returning homeward the kings.). In like manner verses of poetry are held in the mind by expressing the words with images. The choice of the images should include the new and strange, such as eclipses, for the unusual impresses the mind more than the usual. The images which can be held longest in the memory are those which are not mute nor vague, but doing something, those that have distinguished beauty or unique infamy, those that wear crowns or purple garments, those that are deformed or colored red, or those that are ridiculous. Such striking images are readily recalled and in turn bring up the words which they resemble. The author further thinks that each one should pick out his own

images, not relying upon any ready-made lists, such as the Greeks furnished, because the method is impractical, when the number of words is considered, and the student should not be deprived of the labor of research, by material all ready to his hand.[41] As a conclusions to his advice the author says that mnemonics have very little value unless accompanied by industry, study, labor, and diligence. Each day these should be practiced; for the student can attain results only by great labor.

It is evident that no short quick course had been devised to perfect the memory. Indeed the very effort required to apply the system would naturally compel so much attention that the memory could hardly escape being strengthened. Quintilian must have noticed this, for, after explaining the place and image system as applied to names and words, and mentioning some experts who used such systems, especially the division of the zodiac into 360 sections by Metrodorus, he remarks that he does not believe the method efficacious for learning the parts of a continuous speech. An indefinite number of places, an innumerable number of images, would be required to accompany a speech of some length. Added to the multiplicity of places and images would be the double effort of the orator as he was compelled to recall and connect. As a result, the steady flow of his address would cease while he was endeavoring to refer each word to its image. Instead of this system, he believed speeches should be learned in convenient sections, with occasional recourse in difficult passages to marks (places and images) for stimulating and refreshing the memory. He also believed that passages could better be learned by heart, if they were first committed to tablets. As a practical bit of advice he suggested that memorizing should be done in a subdued voice. Essential also was repetition, especially with difficult passages. Above all, "for getting a real grasp . . . . division and artistic structure will be found of great value." Finally, he reached the conclusion that the "most important thing is to learn much by heart and to think much, and, if possible, to do this daily, since there is nothing that is more increased by practice or impaired by neglect than memory." In fact, the "supreme method of memory is practice and industry."[42]

[41]Apparently mnemotechnical dictionaries were already in existence.
[42]Quint. XI. 2. 18-40.

In spite of the rejection by Quintilian of the *ars memoriæ* he nevertheless accorded memory a place among the rhetorical canons. He argued that a speaker must uncover a line of thought, arrange it in telling order, choose proper words to express the arranged ideas, then deliver orally the whole matter. This, however, could not be done unless one remembered what he had invented and arranged and phrased.[43] This philosophical explanation did not remove Quintilian's antagonism to mnemonics nor did it prevent other men from searching for short cuts, because they were fascinated, like Hippias, with the possibility of employing some system to deepen the impressions on the brain. Wilson himself was convinced that the brain could be trained to remember, for, in explaining the place and image method, he seeks to make a "hard matter somewhat plaine" by the use of an example:

> "My friend (whom I tooke ever to bee an honest man) is accused of theft, of adulterie, of ryot, of manslaughter, and of treason: if I would keepe these words in my remembrance, and rehearse them in order as they were spoken, I must appoint five places, the which I had neede to have so perfectly in my memorie, as could be possible. As, for example, I will make these in my Chamber. A doore, a window, a presse, a bedstead, and a chimney. Now in the doore, I will set Cacus the thiefe, or some such notable verlet. In the windowe I will place Venus. In the Presse I will put *Apitius*, that famous Glutton. In the Bedstead I will set Richard, the third king of England, or some notable murtherer. In the Chimney I will place the blacke Smith, or some other notable Traitour. That if one repete these places, and these images twise or thrise together, no doubt though he have but a meane memorie, he shall carrie away the wordes rehearsed with ease. And like as he may doe with these five wordes, so may he doe with five score, if he have places fresh in his remembrance, and doe but use himselfe to this trade one fortnight together."[44]

Wilson was only one of countless rhetoricians who so revered memory that they adopted her as the mother of the Muses. Mnemosyne, fair goddess, guardian of the treasure of eloquence, should help them to train the youth intrusted to their care. With a system the teachers would sink so deep the images and words into the tablets of the youthful mind, that the pupils would no longer flounder as they gave a taste of their quality in "passionate speech." Unlike Hamlet they would remember

[43] Quint. III. 3. 10.

[44] Wilson, *Art of Rhet.* Edited by G. H. Mair.

"All saws of books, all forms, all pressures past,
That youth and observation copied there."

Taking advantage of the belief of rhetoricians that a *Memoria Technica* was possible, charlatans arose who made the wildest claims. Martin Sommer, for instance, advertised that his system would enable a man, after reading many books in a library *"to write down every sentence of what he has read many days after at home.* The proficient in this science can dictate matters of the most opposite nature to ten or thirty writers alternately! After four weeks' exercise he will be able to class twenty-five thousand disarranged portraits within the saying of a paternoster."[45] In nine lessons of one hour each the victim would become master of this mighty art.

With the passing of the years, however, the notion that the memory of orators can be trained by systematic devices has almost disappeared. Memory itself remains and is highly esteemed, yet it has lost its ancient importance. Long ago Plato foresaw this when he remarked that the invention of writing by the Egyptian God, Theuth, caused learners to trust external written characters rather than themselves.[46] That he was right may be judged from the number of speakers who read their addresses. Hippias, however, belonged to the old school; he believed he could train the memories of the future statesmen. His labors must have had a measure of success, sufficient indeed to encourage others. Since his day thousands have followed his idea, like a will-o'-the-wisp, through the bogs of discipline. At last sinking beyond their depth, they have disappeared, leaving only a few bubbles to remind the world that Memory, "the warder of the mind," was once a canon of rhetoric.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AELIANI, *Varia Historia.*
ARISTOTLE, *Rhetoric.*
ARISTOTLE, *de Anima, de Mem., Topics.*
ATHENAEUS
AUCTOR AD HERENNIUM, ED. MARX.
BLASS, F., *Die Attische Beredsamkeit.*
CAESAR, *de Bello Gallico.*

[45]Quoted from Middleton-Fellows' *Memory Systems*, p. 15.

[46]Plato, *Phaed.* 275 A. Caesar says that the Druids forbade the writing of their ritual in order to keep the memory strong. *Bel. Gal.* VI. 14.

CICERO, *de Oratore, Brutus, Partitiones.*
CICERO, *de Finibus, Academica.*
CLEMENT, *Stromata.*
CROISET, A. and M. *Histoire de la Lit. Grecque,* tome IV.
DIELS, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker.*
GOMPERZ, *Greek Thinkers.*
GROTE, *History of Greece,* Vol. VIII.
MIDDLETON, A. E., and FELLOWS, G. S., *Memory Systems, New and Old.*
MAHLY J., *Der Sophist Hippia von Elis.* See Rh. Mus. below.
NORDEN, E., *Antike Kunstprosa.*
OSANN, F., *Der Sophist Hippias als Archaolog.* See Rh. Mus. below.
PLATO, *Hippias Major* and *Minor, Protagoras, Phaedrus, Apology, Republic, Theaetetus.*
PLATO, Translations by Jowett, and Bruges in Bohn Library.
PLUTARCH, *Numa Pompilius, Lycurgus, Lives of Ten Orators.*
PHILOSTRATUS, *Lives of the Sophists,* Loeb Edition.
PAUSANIAS, *Description of Greece.*
QUINTILIAN, *Institutes of Oratory,* Ed. Loeb.
RHEINISCHES MUSEUM II: 495 (1843), see Osann above.
RHEINISCHES MUSEUM XV: 514 (1860), XVI: 38 (1861). See Mahly above.
SHIDAS.
SPENGEL, *Artium Scriptores.*
UEBERWEG, *History of Philosophy.*
WILSON, T., *Art of Rhetorique,* ed. Mair.
XENOPHON, *Memorabilia, Symposium.*
ZELLER, *Pre-Socratic Philosophy.*

COLERIDGE AND RHETORIC

RAYMOND F. HOWES
University of Pittsburgh

LESS than a year before his death in 1834, Samuel Taylor Coleridge sent Henry Coleridge a picture of himself, under which he had written a line from Ovid: "Non formosus erat, sed erat facundus Ulysses." He was evidently in a facetious mood that day for he added the following translation:

> "In truth he's no Beauty!" cry'd Moll, Poll, and Tab;
> But they all of them own'd He'd the gift of the Gab.

Though not precisely suitable for an epitaph, the lines do, nevertheless, strike a note which was dominant in his life. Coleridge, above all, was a talker. At the age of ten he was riding

from tavern to tavern on the shoulder of his uncle, drinking, talking, and disputing as if he had been a man. He was not long past this age when Charles Lamb used to see casual passers through the cloisters of Christ's Hospital stand, entranced with admiration, to hear him unfold, in his deep and sweet intonations, the mysteries of Jamblichus or Plotinus. And at Cambridge he declaimed in Latin, and preached the doctrine of pantisocracy with fervid eloquence. So effective, indeed, was his talk in those days that when he went to Llanfyllin to obtain recruits for his ideal community, "two great huge fellows of butcher-like appearance danced about the room in enthusiastic agitation. And one of them of his own accord called for a large glass of brandy, and drank it off to this, his own toast, 'God save the King! And may he be the last.' "

In later life Coleridge lectured, with varying success; the lowest point being reached, perhaps, on that night when Crabb Robinson was moved to comment: "To Coleridge's lecture, where I slept." But whatever Robinson thought of the lectures (and many of them he considered excellent), he never tired of Coleridge's private talk. If he had, he would not have gone to see the poet so frequently; for whenever and wherever he met him, Coleridge was discoursing. These notes are typical:

"Bkfasted with Serjt. Rough & then walked with him to see Coleridge at Hammersmith. We found him not quite well but very eloquent."

"On the 21st of Decr. I accompanied Cargill to Coleridge when we found he had been very ill, but he was able to expatiate eloquently on the distinction bet. fancy & imagination."

Not all of Coleridge's visitors were so sympathetic, however. One day in 1830 a certain Dr. Chalmers called, with his wife and daughter, at Highgate. Coleridge's version of the affair is that they "spent an hour" with him, "which the good doctor declared on parting to have been a 'refreshment' such as he had not enjoyed for a long season." Dr. Chalmers represented the visit as having lasted three hours, and said that during that "stricken" period he got occasional glimpses of what the prophet "would be at." His little daughter, however, was so moved by the "mellifluous flow of discourse" that, when "the music ceased, her overwrought feelings found relief in tears."

Stories of Coleridge's converse with friends and acquaintances, and tributes to his eloquence abound in any of his biographies. A

careful reading of J. D. Campbell's *Life* of the poet gives the idea that is strengthened by the comments of Hazlitt, De Quincey, Lamb, and others of his friends. Hazlitt calls him "the most impressive talker of his age." Lamb says, "Great in his writings, he was greatest in his conversation." M. Legouis, the living author of *The Early Life of Wordsworth*, speaks of Coleridge as "one greater in his conversation than in his writings." And Lord Egmont remarked to De Quincey that "he talked very much like an angel."

It is no surprise, therefore, to find that Coleridge himself preferred the spoken to the written word. In a letter to John Thelwall, Nov. 19, 1796, he says, "I compose very little, and I absolutely hate composition, and such is my dislike that even a sense of duty is sometimes too weak to overpower it." In much the same vein he writes to Sir George Beaumont on Dec. 7, 1811, "I detest writing politics, even on the right side." Yet he could not stop writing, much as he desired to do so. "I had time out of mind given it up as a lost cause, given myself over, I mean, a predestined author, though without a drop of true *author* blood in my veins," he tells John Taylor Coleridge (April 8, 1825); and he mingles resignation and despair in a cry to his publisher, Joseph Cottle: "So I am forced to write for bread." (The letter is dated Feb. 22, 1796.)

The only practical compromise he could make was to dictate his works. This he did in the case of *Biographia Literaria*, *Zapolya*, and several other of his productions. And the process brought some relief, as we may see from another passage in the letter to Cottle quoted above: "The slowness with which I get on with my pen in my own hand contrasts most strangely with the rapidity with which I dictate."

This dislike of the manual work of composition has often been attributed to Coleridge's laziness. There is evidence, however, to show that there was another reason, based on a clear conception of the relative value of written and spoken words as media of communication. The most concise expression of this idea is found in a letter to Wordsworth on May 30, 1815. "It is not in *written words*," says Coleridge, "but by the hundred modifications that looks make and tone, and denial of the *full* sense of the very words used, that one can reconcile the struggle between sincer-

ity and diffidence." Oral discourse, to him, as to Plato, was a living, vital thing; written discourse a dead, and far more cumbersome method of communication. It is not strange then, that H. N. Coleridge is led to remark that at least half of Coleridge's disciples learned their lesson of philosophy from the teacher's mouth:

> "He has been to them as an old oracle of the Academy or Lyceum. The fulness, the inwardness, the ultimate scope of his doctrines has never yet been published in print, and if disclosed, it has been from time to time in the higher moments of conversation, when occasion, and mood, and person begot an exalted crisis. More than once has Mr. Coleridge said, that with pen in hand he felt a thousand checks and difficulties in expressing his meaning; but that—authorship aside—he never found the smallest hitch or impediment in the fullest utterance of his most subtle fancies by word of mouth. His abstrusest thoughts became more rhythmical and clear when chaunted to their own music."[1]

It seems strange somehow, that one whose influence was in so great part diffused through conversation, should have said so little about rhetoric. Almost never does Coleridge use the word, and his references to it are rarely direct. De Quincey tells us that Coleridge was "in the habit of drawing the line with much philosophical beauty between Rhetoric and Eloquence," but he adds, "on this topic we were never so fortunate as to hear him."[2] The same misfortune befalls one who attempts to find that distinction explained in Coleridge's writings. A hint as to what he meant may, however, be gleaned from a letter to the Rev. Edward Coleridge, July 23, 1823:

> "I make and mean the same distinction between oratory and eloquence as between the mouth plus the windpipe and the heart plus the brain."

Other incidental references in *The Friend*, the *Biographia Literaria*, and in his letters make it plain that Coleridge thought of rhetorical theory as a body of empty rules for making trivial ideas impressive and persuasive.

As a result, he followed Plato in denouncing the sophists. He says:

> "To shape, to dye, to paint over, and to mechanize the mind, he

[1]This passage is contained in an unsigned review of *The Poetical Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge* in the *Quarterly Review*, Vol. LII, August, 1834.

[2]*De Quincey's Works*, edited by David Masson, Vol. X, p. 92.

(Plato) resigned, as their proper trade, to the sophists, against whom he waged open and unremitting war. For the ancients, as well as the moderns, had their machinery for the extemporaneous mintage of intellects, by means of which, off-hand, as it were, the scholar was enabled to make a figure on any and all subjects, on any and all occasions."[3]

Coleridge followed Plato, too, in believing that the primary function of man is to find truth. Unless the rhetorician has some ultimate principle on which to base his ideas, he accomplishes nothing worthy. His eloquence and logical skill render him only the more pernicious.[4] Following this line of thought, Coleridge declared that "no man was ever yet a great poet without being at the same time a profound philosopher," and he lauded Burke as a rhetorician because he referred habitually to principles. Burke, to him, was great not because of his practical influence on public opinion, but because he "possessed and had sedulously sharpened that eye, which sees all things, actions, and events, in relation to the laws that determine their existence and circumscribe their possibility. . . He was a scientific statesman, and therefore a seer."[5]

The true rhetorician, then, is he who sees in everything basic principles or laws, and applies them to the particular problem under discussion. He differs from the poet, says Coleridge, only in this, that for him the inculcation of truth is the immediate object, while for the latter it is the ultimate end, the immediate purpose being to give pleasure.[6]

Once attained, this philosophic insight, Coleridge believed, will provide not only the material, but the method for communication. In the first place, it leads the writer or speaker to employ deductive rather than inductive reasoning. The highest truths, he says, cannot be reached by the inductive method; they come not through the correlation of observed facts, but intuitively, through the pure reason. If the rhetorician has a guiding principle at the start, its presence will, of itself, unify the parts of the discourse, making a formal plan unnecessary. The same result appears when a single emotion is at work.

"In many instances the predominance of some mighty passion takes

[3]The Friend, Vol. II of *The Complete Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, edited by W. T. G. Shedd (1884), p. 430.

[4]*Ibid.*, p. 400.

[5]*Biographia Literaria*, (H. M. Coleridge, ed., New York, 1891) p. 296.

[6]*Ibid.*, p. 448.

the place of the guiding thought, and the result presents the method of nature, rather than the habit of the individual."[7]

He concludes that "the term, method, cannot therefore, otherwise than by abuse, be applied to a mere dead arrangement, containing in itself no principle of progression."[8]

Winans points out that a speech should have unity of thought and feeling, and that both enter into and are subordinate to a third unity, that of purpose. Coleridge contends that unity of thought or unity of feeling alone will make a discourse an organic whole.

The error in Coleridge's contention is an obvious one, easily illustrated from his own essays and lectures. He forgets the possibility of any time limit. One lecture from his series in 1812 will serve as an example. Coleridge had announced that he would talk on classic and romantic poetry. Crabb Robinson, who attended, made this note in his diary:

"Three-fourths of the lecture a declamation on Atheism. He meant to introduce, by a reference to religion, the German antithesis between paganism & Christianity, which was itself to be merely an introduction to the contrast between classic and romantic poetry. But as usual he wasted his time on the introduction to the introduction!"[9]

There can be little doubt that on this occasion Coleridge had a single guiding thought, but the lack of a formal plan to adapt his presentation to the allotted time made the lecture incomplete. The same fault appears frequently in his essays written for periodicals, especially those that appeared in *The Friend*. There, again, he had a definite limit, and found it impossible, without a formal plan, to adapt his material to it.

In his discussions of style Coleridge recurs to the idea that a unifying principle is of supreme importance. He cites Burke as one whose arrangement of thoughts and manner of expression grew directly from his philosophic habit of mind. In Burke these elements of style are "grounded on the habit of foreseeing, in each integral part, or (more plainly) in every sentence, the whole

[7] *Biographia Literaria*, p. 415.

[8] Ibid., p. 417.

[9] H. C. Robinson, *Blake, Coleridge, Wordsworth, Lamb, etc.*, (E. J. Morley, ed., Manchester University Press, 1922), p. 134.

that he then intends to communicate. However irregular and desultory his talk, there is method in the fragments."[10]

Coleridge has more to say on the narrower subject of diction. The central proposition, which he enforces again and again, is that communication of thought without encumbrance is the goal. He frequently condemns devices that draw the reader's attention to the writer's cleverness rather than to his ideas. Speaking of the formation of his own critical opinions in his youth, he says:

> "I excluded from the list of worthy feelings . . . . the desire of exciting wonderment at his powers in the author. Oftentimes since then, in perusing French tragedies, I have fancied two marks of admiration at the end of each line, as hieroglyphics of the author's own admiration at his own cleverness."[11]

In the same vein he denounces much of the writing of his time:

> "Even our prose writings, nay even the style of our more set discourses, strive to be in the fashion, and trick themselves out in the soiled and over-worn finery of the meretricious muse. It is true that of late a great improvement in this respect is observable in our most popular writers. But it is equally true, that this recurrence to plain sense and genuine mother English is far from being general; and that the composition of our novels, magazines, public harangues, and the like, is commonly as trivial in thought, and yet enigmatic in expression, as if Echo and Sphinx had laid their heads together to construct it."[12]

Good diction, therefore, is that which most appropriately fits the thought. Any trick of language, any excess of imagery, which tends to distract attention from the ideas to be conveyed, is indefensible. There is a foreshadowing here of Spencer's theory of economy of attention. And there is an underlying conception that rhetoric, or, to use Colerirge's own term, eloquence, is a concealed art, not a process of tricking out the commonplace in the finery of elegant verbosity.

In fact, Coleridge seems at times to lean too far toward simplicity in denouncing the Oriental influence. He praises Archbishop Leighton for his absence of coloring, for that grey tone which Pater, with his finely-tuned sense of literary values, noticed

[10] *Biographia Literaria*, p. 409.
[11] *Biographia Literaria*, p. 157.
[12] *Ibid*, p. 465.

in Coleridge's own prose. The comment on Leighton, summing up, as it does, Coleridge's theory of the relation of thought to language, is worth quotating in *toto*:[13]

"Perspicuous, I had almost said transparent, his style is *elegant* by the mere compulsion of the thoughts and feelings, and in despite, as it were, of the writer's wish to the contrary. Profound as his conceptions often are, and numerous as the passages are, where the most *athletic* thinker will find himself tracing a rich vein from the surface downward, and leave off with an unknown depth for to-morrow's delving—yet there is this quality peculiar to Leighton, unless we add Shakespeare—that there is always a scum on the very surface which the simplest may understand, if they have head and heart to understand anything. The same or nearly the same excellence characterizes his eloquence. Leighton had by nature a quick and pregnant fancy, and the august objects of his habitual contemplation, and their remoteness from the outward senses, his constant endeavor to see or to bring all things under some point of unity, but, above all, the rare and vital union of head and heart, of light and love in his character,—all these working conjointly could not fail to form and nourish in him the higher power, akin to reason, the power, I mean, of imagination. And yet in his freest and most figurative passages there is a *subduedness*, a self-checking timidity in his colouring, a sobering silver-grey tone over all; and an experienced eye may easily see where and in how many instances Leighton has substituted neutral tints for a strong light or bold relief—by this sacrifice, however, of particular effects, giving an increased permanence to the impression of the whole, and wonderfully facilitating its soft and quiet *illapse* into the very recesses of our convictions. Leighton's happiest ornaments of style are made to appear as efforts on the part of the author to express himself *less* ornamentally, more plainly."

This plainess, this lack of ornamentation, which he so profoundly believed to be desirable both in prose and in poetry, Coleridge was unable to find in most of the poets of his own time. The faults of the preceding age were, he asserted, different from those of the moderns, but both represented deviations from the golden mean of sound thought plus simple diction.

"In the former, from Donne to Cowley, we find the most fantastic out-of-the-way thoughts, but in the most pure and genuine mother English; in the latter the most obvious thoughts, in language the most fantastic and arbitrary. Our faulty elder poets sacrificed the passion and passionate flow of poetry to the subtleties of intellect and to starts of wit; the moderns to the glare and glitter of a perpetual, yet broken and

[13]The passage occurs in a letter to John Murray, January 18, 1822. *The Letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, II: 718.

heterogeneous imagery, or rather to an amphibious something, made up, half of image, and half of abstract meaning. The one sacrificed the heart to the head; the other both heart and head to point and drapery."[14]

In a note to this passage he quotes a ludicrous instance from the poem of a young tradesman:

> No more will I endure love's pleasing pain,
> Or round my *heart's leg* tie his galling chain.

Nowhere, however, does Coleridge go so far as to imply that good rhetoric should lack imagination. His passages dealing with faculty are, on the contrary, perhaps his finest contributions to literary criticism. In that frequently quoted paragraph from Chapter XIV of the *Biographia Literaria* (p. 451).

"This power, first put into action by the will and understanding, and retained under their irremissive, though gentle and unnoticed, control, *laxis effertur habenis*, reveals itself in the balance or reconcilement of opposite or discordant qualities; of sameness, with differences; of the general with the concrete; the idea with the image; the individual with the representative; the sense of novelty and freshness with old and familiar objects; a more than usual state of emotion with more than usual order; judgment ever awake and steady self-possession with enthusiasm and feeling profound or vehement; and while it blends and harmonizes the natural and the artificial, still subordinates art to nature; the manner to the matter; and our admiration of the poet to our sympathy with the poetry."

This definition, though applied to poetry, serves as well for rhetoric. Each division might easily serve as a chapter heading for a text on public speaking; almost every one does, in fact, find at least a paragraph, and often a page or a chapter in our textbooks.

But Coleridge has even more to offer on the psychology of rhetoric. He accepts and explains the traditional distinction between persuasion and conviction in a letter to Daniel Stuart:[15]

"It is among the feeblenesses of our nature," he writes, "that we are often, to a certain degree, acted on by stories, gravely asserted, of which we do most religiously disbelieve every syllable, nay, which we perhaps know to be false. The truth is that images and thoughts possess a power in, and of themselves, independent of that act of judgment or understanding by which we affirm or deny the existence of a reality correspondent to them. Such is the ordinary state of the mind in dreams.

[14] *Biographia Literaria*, pp. 157, 158.
[15] Coleridge's *Letters*, Vol. II, p. 663.

It is not strictly accurate to say that we believe our dreams to be actual while we are dreaming. We neither believe it, nor disbelieve it. With the will the comparing power is suspended, and without the comparing power, any act of judgment, whether affirmation or denial, is impossible. The forms and thoughts act merely by their own inherent power, and the strong feelings at times apparently connected with them are, in point of fact, bodily sensations which are the causes or occasions of the images; not (as when we are awake) the effects of them."

This theory, that thoughts and images, acting by their own inherent power, may induce action, is important. If accepted, it means that the speaker, by rhetorical means, can suspend the judgment and understanding of his audience, and cause them to act contrary to their convictions. Images can overthrow belief. Whether persuasion and conviction are psychologically separate cannot be decided here; but it is interesting to note on which side of the controversy Coleridge takes his stand.

It is interesting, too, to find Coleridge foreshadowing, rather vaguely, to be sure, the James-Lange theory of emotion. Bodily sensations, he says, are the causes or occasions of the images in dreams; this same idea, translated into terms of emotions and actions while awake, is the essence of the James-Lange theory.

Another important psychological observation set down by Coleridge concerns the "*antithetical* balance-loving nature of man,"[16] which he considered the source of pleasure in the fine arts. This is the same phenomenon that Poe called the human enjoyment of equality, and declared to be the basis for composition and appreciation of verse. Antithesis and balance are two rhetorical figures that have persisted since the dawn of public speaking. Their power has long been recognized, but it has not always been seen, perhaps, that the reason for their force lies so deep in human psychology.

In addition to the general contributions to the theory of rhetoric already mentioned, Coleridge gives here and there, in letters and books, some practical suggestions on argumentation. For example, there is this with regard to the use of evidence from authorities:

"To offer or to receive names in lieu of sound arguments, is only less reprehensible than an ostentatious contempt of the great men of former ages; but we may well and wisely avail ourselves of authorities, in con-

[16]Letter to Sir Humphrey Davy, *Letters*, Vol. II, p. 516.

firmation of truth, and above all, in the removal of prejudices founded on imperfect information."[17]

Again, in the *Biographia Literaria* (p. 319), he expounds the use of literal analogies as aids in interpreting contemporary politics:

"On every great occurrence I endeavored to discover in past history the event that most nearly resembled it. I procured, where it was possible, the contemporary historians, memorialists, and pamphleteers. Then fairly subtracting the points of difference from those of likeness, as the balance favored the former or the latter, I conjectured that the result would be the same or different."

His success as a political essayist on the *Morning Post* and the *Courier* may be attributed to the validity of this method of argument. His predictions were uncanny in their accuracy, and gained for him a wide reputation as a keen political observer.

Another sound argumentative practice that he adopted in cases where he had reason to suppose his audience antagonistic, was, as he put it, "to assign the grounds of my belief, rather than the belief itself; and not to express dissent, till I could establish some points of complete sympathy, some grounds common to both sides, from which to commence its explanation."[18] There is a close affinity between this method and that which Mrs. Graham calls the natural procedure in argument, the plan of which is "simply to portray a situation which gradually, of itself, without compulsion or contention on the part of the speaker, through the compelling power of a developing situation makes evident to the mind of the hearer the necessity of one certain solution."[19]

To Coleridge, then, although he had a questionable understanding of the term rhetoric, and was often deficient himself in rhetorical practice, we can attribute a profound realization of the power of the spoken word, a statement of the value of unity of thought and feeling, a sound conception of the relation of ideas to style and diction, a comprehensive definition of imagination, a psychological explanation of the distinction between persuasion and conviction, a note or two on rhetorical figures, and several practical suggestions for argumentation. His contribution, per-

[17] *The Friend*, p. 442.
[18] *Biographia Literaria*, p. 181.
[19] QUARTERLY JOURNAL, XI, 4, p. 321.

haps, is not great; certainly it is not unified; but it is nevertheless noteworthy from one who made no attempt to formulate a complete rhetorical theory. Rhetoric is only one of the many fields enriched by the overflow of what De Quincey called, with evident exaggeration, but with undoubted sincerity, "the largest and most spacious intellect, the subtlest and most comprehensive, in my judgment, that has yet existed among men."

SPEECH DISORDERS AND THE TEACHING OF SPEECH*

WILLIAM J. FARMA
Washington Square College, New York University

The purpose of this paper is to discuss, not to define or affirm, the application of the new psychology which I shall call the "Science of Human Behavior" to the teaching of Speech in elementary classes such as a first year course in Public Speaking. There is a problem involved here that is increasingly coming to the attention of educators in Speech. The idea of such an application has been given impetus by the success which has been achieved in the use of the principles of the Science of Human Behavior in the Speech Clinic for correction of abnormal speech disorders.

The functional speech disorder such as stuttering is an outward manifestation of an inward emotional maladjustment. The fact that the maladjustment has manifested itself in a specific manner and in a way that gives the sufferer immediate mental distress makes it what is called a speech defect and a case for the clinic. But there are many students in public speaking courses who are handicapped by an emotional instability which does not manifest itself as a speech defect in the sense in which I have defined the term. Emotional conflicts may show themselves in the classroom in hundreds of minor ways ranging from trifling mannerisms or a too-rapid rate of speech to over-self-consciousness or a dogmatic, over-confident manner.

It is my purpose in this paper, then, to discuss the extension of the principles of speech psycho-therapy from the speech clinic to the speech classroom. There is nothing unusual or new in this

*Read at the New York Convention, Dec. 31, 1925.

idea. Just as psycho-therapeutic principles are being extended from the psychiatric clinic to the general field of education with such significant books as "Psychanalysis in the Classroom" by G. H. Green and "The New Psychology and the Teacher" by H. C. Miller as pioneers in the movement, so may those principles be extended from the speech clinic to the speech class room.

But there is a premise which must be well established before the discussion of such an extension can be profitably entered into—and that has to do with the ultimate aims of speech training. In suggesting that the Science of Human Behavior, which primarily has to do with the adjustments of the human being to his social environment, be an *active* factor in the speech teacher's technique of instruction, one must assume that the ultimate aim of the speech teacher is to train the student in social adaptibility through the medium of speech, or as Mr. Woolbert expresses it "a venture in social adjustment." This is a very broad conception of speech. It is one which has gradually evolved with the growth of speech training as a respected factor in the educational curriculum.

As I see it there have been four steps in the development of speech pedagogy. The first was the general revolt which took place at the end of the last century against the elocution and oratory of artifice and display. At that time speech training rightfully came into ill repute through its superficial methods of teaching platform tricks. It applied its principles externally. It attacked the effect rather than the cause. With the revolt came a gradual reversal of the whole method of attack. With the new method came the logical foundation on which the technique of speech teaching is based today. By seeking out and adjusting or stimulating the inner causation forces—thoughts, feelings, moods, dispositions, understandings, appreciations, etc.—it brought about the desired change in the outward symbols of communication. This principle of moving from cause to effect is clearly illustrated in the present-day method of correction of an abnormal form of speech behavior—that of stuttering. Today we see stuttering simply as an outward symptom of an inward maladjustment. The method of treating stuttering used twenty years ago—and still used in certain places—of superimposing on the victim a new rhythm of speech or a new pitch in the voice is attacking the symptom rather than the cause. The old school of elocution involved the same illogical principle.

It tried to correct a bad inflection or an awkward gesture by superimposing a new one all nicely laid out by the teacher. So this first step in the evolution of speech pedagogy was a significant one.

The second came with the development of the behavioristic psychology of Watson. Its application to speech simply stated is that speech is a complete bodily process; that voice, and gestures, and emotions, and thoughts all involve physical activity that reverberates throughout the body; and that only when a stimulus to speak or to gesture is realized in a complete bodily response unrestricted by inhibitions or bodily sets, is it adequate for speech purposes. This is simply a scientific method of expanding the principle of cause to effect. It substitutes the term stimulus for cause and response for effect. It offers to teachers the scientific technique of an increasingly important mechanistic psychology as a method of tracing the progression of bodily activity from the inner causation forces to the outer manifestations. Such knowledge has proved to be of great importance to the scientific teaching of speech. As an illustration, I shall show the bearing it has had on the teaching of oral expression. A very important behavioristic principle is that certain stimuli produce certain responses that move in definite bodily patterns—"pattern reactions" they are called by Watson. I quote the beginning sentences from a theory of oral expression as given in a graduate course at the University of Wisconsin, which illustrates the application of this behavioristic principle:

> **"Speech is a complete bodily process. For effective oral expression the expressive mechanism must be freed for unhampered responses. We must have this complete process functioning as a working basis before we can direct responses into significant artistic or communicative symbols, if those symbols are to be true to the person and the thing expressed. There are three corollaries to this basic principle:**
>
> 1. **Every bodily change is an expression of an emotion of a certain degree.**
> 2. **A definite emotion tends to move in certain definite and fundamental inward and outward bodily directions and patterns.**
> 3. **A true expression of an emotion or mood or disposition must arrive at the fundamental and characteristic bodily patterns of it."**

This quotation expresses one of the basic principles of what is in my opinion a most applicable theory of oral expression.

As another illustration of how behavioristic psychology influenced the teaching of speech I quote from the Woolbert and Weaver

high school text, "Better Speech." The lines are taken from a chapter entitled, "Thinking for Speech." The sub-title to these particular lines is "Recall by Using the Whole Body."

"Have you ever studied *the way* you bring things back to mind? This is the chief point to note. The more you use your whole body in trying to recall something, the better your chance of success. Just watch somebody trying hard to remember. He will lift his head, then turn it this way and that, then sit back or lean forward, then twist and squirm in his seat, then lift his feet and kick around with them, and finally get up and pace the floor. Our difficult remembering we do just in that way. What is more, you will notice while you are trying to remember, that you harden almost all your muscles; head, neck, arms and hands, back, trunk, and legs. Most especially you can feel the heavy, tight feeling around the abdomen. All this is a part of the attempt to bring back the *muscular position* in which you were when you did the thing to be recalled."

Behavioristic psychology has been a vital force in giving the teacher a scientific understanding of the speech mechanisms. It has helped the teacher to see speech as not simply a matter of voice, gesture, and platform movements, but as an infinitely complex bodily activity. And in that sense it has had a broadening influence on the concept of speech. But the inherent mechanistic nature of behavioristic psychology tends to put emphasis primarily on the physical side of speech. It visualizes the speaker as a complete system of muscles and glands working together to produce a unified physical force, the personality. And when a teacher's interest is directed toward the conditioning of those muscular activities to produce an effective working unit, his endeavors are likely to be too much centered in the bodily mechanisms rather than in the psychic relationship of the personality to the audience. This brings me to the third step in my survey. It is in the form of a transition from the behavioristic psychology to what might be called a transcendental psychology. It is the psychology of human behavior and conduct. It concedes the scientific truthfulness of Watson's analysis of the mechanisms that make up the personality and transcends it. The purpose of this new psychology is to analyze human nature, human methods of meeting its environment. It aims to analyze the larger functional units of the personality. It has sought to classify in a scientific manner the various normal and abnormal modes of adjustment of the human being to its sur-

roundings. It has had vast opportunities for experimentation in mental hygiene clinics which have so rapidly increased in numbers in the past ten years. As speech came to be understood as an inherent and inseparable factor in the whole bodily mechanism, it was inevitable that this new psychology of human adaptability should be applied in the correction of poor speech conditions. Dr. Smiley Blanton was one of the first to apply its principles in his speech clinic, and it is to him that we are indebted for many of the basic theories of the present day methods which we are so sure are on the right track.

We can see then in the application of this broader psychology to abnormal cases of speech the transition from the mechanistic view of speech to a transcendental one which undertakes to analyze the psychic adjustments of the personality through the medium of the speech mechanisms. Speech training came as a result of this transition to be understood as training in the development of the personality when personality is defined as the unified aspect of the individual's mode of adjustment to his environment.

Mr. Woolbert in his article "The Psychological Basis of Speech Training" expresses this relationship of speech training to personality development quite vividly. He says:

> "In a strikingly justifiable sense speech training is training in personality. Vague as that term is, still it suggests always one's powers of expression; bodily carriage, movement of head, arms, hands, torso; richness and flexibility of voice; mastery of language; fertility, timeliness, and fitness of concepts, ideas, feelings, and attitudes—the outward marks of an inward grace, the expression of one's selfhood, the revelation of one's character, and even of the soul itself. And the aim of training in personality must always be stated in terms of richness of life, social adaptability, and ability to take one's part in the life of the race."

The concluding sentence in this quotation from Mr. Woolbert acts as an excellent transition to the final step in my survey. I should emphasize in that sentence the expression "social adaptability." It is just that, social adaptability, through training in communication which I think has come to be the ultimate end in speech training. It is the culmination of a gradual evolution of principles which I have traced through certain phases. It sets up an end to be accomplished which is very idealistic and it is difficult to see sometimes how the practical, immediate purposes of the classroom can realize such an ultimate end. But training

with such an end in view is vitally needed in the educational curriculum today. The student in our schools needs more than anything the training in adapting himself and what he has learned to the demands of society. The study of mental hygiene and in particular of the functional disorders of speech has called attention to a large number of students in our schools who are not successfully meeting the social situation. *Too much stress has been put on the impression and retention of facts and figures and not enough on expression and communication of them.* Emphasis has been largely on the side of training the intellect and as a result there is a decided need for training of the emotions. The latest conception of intelligence asserts that the state of emotional stability greatly conditions the degree of intelligence. So when education directs its energies to the receptive side of the person or what Barbara Low calls "direct education," it neglects a vital part of training in intelligence. Barbara Low describes this training of the intellect at the expense of the emotions as a splitting of conscious from unconscious activity. As a result, she says, "We produce individuals, the products of a most advanced 'intellectual' educational system, who yet remain infantile and regressive in their inmost selves—above all, in methods of thinking and feeling."

It would be impossible to estimate to any degree of accuracy how many students are graduated, dropped, or expelled from our high schools and colleges who are pathetically in need of enlightened advice and treatment in mental and emotional hygiene. Here at Washington Square College, where there is a high percentage of high-strung nervous types, I should say that approximately fifteen percent of my students are cases of maladjustment. If that fifteen percent should go on through this college without any assistance in re-educating their emotions, all the academic learning they might acquire as undergraduates could not compensate for the handicap they would carry with them into life.

The speech classroom and in particular the public speaking platform offer, I believe, the greatest opportunities for training in socializing the personality—in stabilizing unbalanced emotions—in achieving harmony between the conscious and unconscious forces in the individual. Twists in the personality are brought into focus on the platform. The daydreamer will fail to establish audience contact, the introvert will fail to objectify his ideas, the inferiority

complex type will be over self-depreciatory or else over compensate, the infantile type will stop abruptly and walk spunkily to his seat, and the physical extrovert will lack audience sympathy; the hysterical neurotic will have frequent colds and be absent on the day when she is to speak. There is no other place in the high school or college where the teacher has such an excellent opportunity to learn the character traits of his students. The traits he comes to know are significant and vital ones, those which will later determine the student's success in meeting the reality of life. It is easy to see why this should be. To the inexperienced the making of a speech before a group of apprehensive students and a teacher with a space in his class book for an impending grade is a thing to be dreaded. It is far worse than writing an examination. It is a difficult crisis which might easily turn into a catastrophe if something should slip. And a year course is just "one damn crisis after another." I have always defended final examinations because I believe they offer excellent training in the ability to meet a crisis; and what is life— a life that means anything at least—but the meeting of one crisis after another? Beginning of school, deaths, operations, beginning of high school, going to the dentist, another death, the first interview for a position, closing a business deal, acting on a first night, addressing a board of directors, a proposal of marriage, the birth of a child, the first day of teaching, addressing a convention audience, more deaths, and so on through the drama of life. If examinations are valuable in this way, making speeches in a speech course is infinitely more so, because here, the student must adapt his personality to a socialized situation which comes the closest to the crises of life of anything that the school has to offer.

It is in the attempts to meet the difficult problem of adjustment to the speech class audience, then, that the teacher has such an excellent opportunity to diagnose the personality trends of his students. The teacher cannot of course come to conclusions based entirely on what happens on the platform—but with a working knowledge of mental mechanisms as set forth for practical use in the new psychology of behavior he will become increasingly adept in recognizing symptoms of character trends. The following is a list of mental mechanisms which manifest themselves in the speaking of certain students: introversion and extroversion, repression

and suppression, complex-formation, transference-of-the-effect, sublimation, compensation, projection, rationalization, and regression. Understanding the workings of these mental mechanisms and the various symptoms by which they manifest themselves on the platform the teacher can usually come to a fairly well justified opinion of the student's personality problems. With the majority of students, suggestions may be of a general nature and made in the class room. With a smaller number suggestions may be made in the occasional conferences that public speaking courses have as a regular part of the course. But with a still smaller number, what I have roughly estimated to be fifteen percent at Washington Square, more intensive treatment for mental and social hygiene is necessary. This means a minimum of three single-hour conferences if anything that is at all fundamental and permanent is to be accomplished.

I wish at this point to give in a rough way the results of some of my experiments of the past three months in applying principles of psycho-therapy to the public speaking class room. My position at Washington Square as a speech correctionist and an instructor in several sections of public speaking made such experiments possible and legitmate.

Number one is a girl of Jewish extraction. In her first speech she was hopelessly ill at ease, fumbled constantly with her handkerchief and at times seemed to tremble all over. Her subject was an expository treatment of the unusual language, Esperanto. The topic was much too big for her to attempt. She did not have a grasp of the subject; presented its principles vaguely so that it failed completely to come into the experiences and understanding of her audience. There was no central idea or purpose motivating her speech as a whole. It ended abruptly without any attempt at summing up. In other words, it was an unsuccessful speech. She was given the usual suggestions as to relaxation and the importance of finding a subject in which one can forget himself in the desire to get it across; but in her next speech she seemed still more ill at ease and became more and more distressed until I found it necessary to stop her, to reassure her that there really was nothing for her to be afraid of, and permit her to take a fresh start. This helped her delivery for the moment but the content was as vague and purposeless as the first speech. From the symptoms that

appeared in these two speeches I diagnosed her trouble as the difficulty that arises when a person who is apparently an introvert type tries to adjust herself to a real situation which demands well objectified ideas, if they are to interest. In conference this was confirmed. She is a subjective, reflective type of personality. Her home conditions have intensified this condition and set her to day-dreaming. Her father, being a milliner, attempted to satisfy, vicariously at least, the frustrated desire to be in a more manly profession by forcing her to take law. She is far better suited for a literary, linguistic, or journalistic career. The tendency to attempt something beyond her capacity is in evidence throughout her life. Early in the conference she said: "I start lots of things but never seem to finish them. Last summer I started to read three French novels but didn't finish them. I also tried to learn to play tennis." She is interested in many things but, as is typical of the neurotic type of person, would prefer to be a failure at attempting many things and especially big things than to be a success at a few and less ambitious things. To do the latter would mean the admission of being ordinary. And so in the classroom she talks on subjects far beyond her capacity and fails gloriously. She is in a dream world. There are many minor details which point to the diagnosis. After two conferences, she was told how everything she had said contributed toward the diagnosis which was given her at that time. She was surprised to see how pertinent everything she had said was to the diagnosis and rather abashed that she had so completely revealed her mode of mental adjustment to life. She entered eagerly into a plan suggested for correcting her behavior. One of the most important factors in that plan was to apply the aphorism that success begets success. And the first thing she was to do was to find a subject completely within her grasp, no matter how simple, and present it in all its concrete simplicity to the class.

The remaining two cases I shall present in outline form.

The second is a sensation extravert type. He has not as yet successfully socialized his impulses. He has not matured emotionally or intellectually—manifestations of this in the class room are:

I. Of the intellectual immaturity:
   1. Can't get a firm grip on his subject.
   2. No logical consistency.

3. Ideas show no reflection—no analysis.
4. Subjects chosen show a meagre intellectual curiosity.
5. Language and speech very slovenly, much slang.

II. Of the emotional immaturity:
1. Complaining note in voice.
2. Always ready with excuses.
3. Has asked three times for permission to leave room. Twice rejected. Left one time without permission.
4. Careless in dress.
5. Distracting random activity—little improvement after suggestions.

Conclusion drawn after a conference: Intelligence slightly below average. Well-developed sexually but is like a child in his complete objectivity and inability to concentrate. It is impossible to carry on a logical conversation with him. His interests lie entirely in activities which offer physical sensations.

Suggestions were given along the line of developing his will power. Will power depends in no little degree on strengthening the control over impulses through sheer exercising of that control. One can give exercises in will control. I attempted to motivate his application of these suggestions by a frank description of his whole mode of behavior.

The third case—an Irish boy with a decided inferiority complex.

Manifestations:
Very self-conscious.
Afraid to look audience in eye.
Turns shyly away with embarrassed smile when audience laughs at slips.
Monotonous dropping of sentences in a weak, unemphatic manner.
Distracting nervous activity.
Has good ideas but they suffer in a self depreciatory delivery.
Decidedly meek in all conversations with him.

Result of conference: Feels inferior whenever he has contacts with someone of authority. This is the transfer-of-the-effect mechanism at work. His father has completely domineered over him all his life. His father is a police inspector, two inches taller than the patient, has a bad temper and scolds often. Frequently deprecates the boy's lack of he-man qualities though the boy is by no means a "sissie" type. He has never had an opportunity to develop self-confidence nor any occasion to believe he is worth anything at all.

Treatment: Understanding of his situation; reassurance; and suggestion that he canstantly be on his guard against attributing forbidding and threatening qualities to every person of authority or superiority. Also told to seek every opportunity that offers him participation in activities on an equal or superior plane with others; that is, break down the unconscious habit of subordination.

It is difficult to illustrate these cases in such a cursory manner. In order to really see these mental mechanisms at work it is necessary to see all the little things, inflections, posture, bodily movement, reactions to criticism, class attitude, facial expressions, bodily tension. It has become more and more clear to me through an understanding of character trends that they inevitably manifest themselves in outward symbols which are common to behavior in general. And as a public speaking teacher I realize more and more the futility of telling a student he must eradicate these outward symbols, of telling him he must be more concrete, he must eradicate the apologetic sound in his voice, he must talk more slowly, he must be more sympathetic to his audience, he must not be so pompous and dogmatic, without correcting the inner causes.

In concluding I should like to anticipate a certain reaction which I feel impending. The new psychology has given terms, and rather high sounding terms to personality traits that people of insight and common sense come to understand through frequent human contacts. It is not necessary to know Watson and his followers, Freud and his followers, to be blessed with this understanding. But I contend that if a student acquire a working knowledge of this new psychology in his training as a teacher he can begin teaching with a vital pedagogical equipment that would take him years to develop through experience; I believe that very few would ever come to a complete and sound understanding of human nature simply through an empirical development.

SELECTED REFERENCES

ROBERT WEST: *Purposive Speaking*, Macmillan Co., N. Y.

GEORGE H. GREEN: *Psychanalysis in the Class Room*, G. P. Putnam's Sons, N. Y. Excellent Bibliography.

H. CRICHTON MILLER: *The New Psychology and the Teacher*, Thomas Seltzer, N. Y.

GEO. V. N. DEARBORN: *The Influence of Joy*, Little, Brown & Co. Boston.
BARBARA LOW: *An Outline of Psycho-Analysis*, Geo. Allen & Unwin.
J. J. PUTNAM: *Human Motives*. Heineman.
OSKER PFISTER: *Psychoanalysis in the Service of Education*. Moffat, Yard & Co. N. Y.
FLOYD H. ALLPORT: *Social Psychology*. Houghton Mifflin Co. N. Y.
THOMAS V. MOORE: *Dynamic Psychology*.

PATHOLOGY AND REEDUCATION OF SPEECH DISORDERS*

MAY K. (MRS. EDWARD W.) SCRIPTURE
School of Education, New York University

II. REEDUCATION OF SPEECH DISORDERS

FRANZ, in his book, *Nervous and Mental Reëducation*, says, "Every means that can be used to bring about a rehabilitation of the individual can be called reëducation." The subject of Speech Reëducation is designed to be of value not only to those who are to come in direct contact with speech disorders but to students and teachers of public speaking, since it outlines the scientific foundation of voice control in speech and points out the methods of dealing with ineffective speech or any of the difficulties attendant upon articulation. Since the causes are physical, neurological, social and psychological, the reëducation of these disturbances must be founded upon methods covering the essential needs of these circumstances.

Dr. Smiley Blanton, director of the Minneapolis Child Guidance Clinic, says the child must learn to play normally, thus saving him from breakdowns. The Child Guidance Clinic serves a useful purpose in helping to prevent actual nervous breakdowns. It also serves a useful purpose in helping the average, normal child grow up without unfortunate emotional attitudes and conflicts, without feeling of timidity or inability to make friends, and without feeling of inferiority that would prevent him from making a success of life.

Dr. C. P. Emerson says, "Reformers with slight knowledge

*Continued from the April number.

of mental hygiene are a menace," so we can add that the parot-like teachings of the various speech institutions whose appeal is to the sufferer in search of a quick cure, are in many cases actually harmful, in that the foundation of a scientific knowledge and teaching of the fundamental elements of speech is lacking. Thus, in one of the better known institutions for the cure of speech disorders, the stutterer is informed that he has but three functions to perform for his cure—take a deep breath, open the mouth and make a noise. These three points are supplemented by prolonged drill upon vowel and consonant exercises, drawling speech, etc. There is nothing provided for the active mind of the stutterer—nothing for the training of the mental imagery or the correct attitude toward speech.

Dr. Gesell of Yale, in his psychological studies, which are designed to aid in the treatment and training of young children, has started the Nursery School idea for the pre-school age child, which gives us the first ray of hope for the theory we speech specialists have advanced about speech at its developmental stage. This early discipline of the child, even at play, may give the opportunity to guide the infantile speech, "baby talk," which if prolonged after the usual time for the organs of speech to adjust themselves, may lead to many other speech disturbances.

Many of the serious speech conflicts have been found to be the result of a maladjustment of the foreign-born child to his American environment. Consequently early insistance upon the correct forms of speech may avoid the defects of speech that crowd our clinics.

In his haste and crowding of subjects into the child's school life, we often meet with the objection, when the subject of Speech is mentioned, that there is no room in the curriculum for any new subject, or that the English Department has already more than it can do, or that speech cares for itself except with the foreigners, for whom there are special classes. This may be answered by saying that Speech, in its broadest sense, serves not only as a mental but a physical hygiene. If the musculature of the speech organs, lungs, larynx, pharynx, mouth, lips, hard and soft palate, uvula, tongue and teeth, nose and other resonance cavities could only have a thorough gymnastic stimulation every time sound is uttered,

the American voice would not be so often called harsh and shrill and the teacher would not have to make it a special subject.

Could these various organs of the young child who starts in the Kindergarten be carefully watched for carelessness, nasality, laxity of tongue, rigidity of jaw, and other complaints with their technical terms we would avoid much of the trouble that is met with in the voices of the students in the High Schools, Training Schools and Colleges.

Thus speech reëducation resolves itself into speech hygiene, and the subject of every-day speech might be made into the subject of character building. Could the time be taken to show what an economical problem this might be for the schools, much could be said in its favor, but when we are asked how many minutes a day should be given in the curriculum to this "new" subject, it is evident that there need be no time at all given it; every time the child reads or answers a question in any grade subject, that is the time to note any inaccuracy, whether it be in the matter of breath control, indistinctness, or any of the manifold unutterably distressful uses of the English language.

Again may it be said that speech hygiene should be both mental and physical and treated from the standpoints of psychology and neurology. Attention to poise, completeness of the thought expressed, rythm, relaxation, association of ideas expressed in succession, would obviate much of the lack of concentration so much discussed in the education of our children today.

The teacher who teaches from the soul will put such feeling into his voice, that that all important quality, *imagination,* will be produced in reply, and we shall then unconsciously be teaching or rather producing self-expression, the need in education today.

The functions of a clinic for speech reëducation should be:

A. Diagnose cases of defective speech and make proper recommendation for treatment.

B. Undertake treatment of defective speech due to

1. **foreign dialect**
2. **provincial dialect**
3. **gross carelessness**
4. **perseverance of infantile speech habits**
5. **functional nervousness**

C. Coöperate with all medical institutions possible for the treatment of defective speech due to congenital malformations, diseases or traumas of the speech mechanism.

Stammering, whether it arises from a functional disturbance or negligence, is comparatively simple in its reëducation compared with the treatment for the stutterer, especially if the phonetic relations are thoroughly understood and if patience and time are given to reëducative processes. Stammering, indistinctness of pronunciation arising from the sounds being improperly articulated, may evidence itself in and be due to

1. muscular defect
2. habitual substitution of one sound for another
3. difficulty in combining sounds (acoustic difficulties)
4. negligence (sluggish mentality)
5. cluttering—nervousness and mental haste
6. malformation of speech mechanism

In the correction of Foreign and Provincial Dialects there is involved;

1, a detailed consideration of phonetics and elementary philology.
2, an analysis of the distinguishing phonetic characteristics of the twenty-five major forms of foreign and provincial dialects current in the United States,
3, study of the methods utilized in the diagnosis and correction of defective speech due to foreign and provincial dialects, and
4, practical corrective work in the special clinics for these disturbances.

The treatment of organic and neurotic speech disorders includes the study of:

1, anatomy and physiology of the speech mechanism,
2, symptomatalogy and treatment of defective speech due to congenital malformations, diseases and traumas of the speech mechanism,
3, symptomatology and treatment of defective speech due to neuropathic and psychoneurotic disturbances, such as the emotional instabilities, psychoneuroses, anxiety hysterias, psychopathic backgrounds, hypertonicity of muscles, speech conflicts, adolescent disturbances and excessive mental activities which result in the different forms of stuttering and cluttering.
4, practical laboratory work for each case individually, and eventually collectively.

Clinical measures to be employed should include, first, laboratory diagnosis, second, individual study of each patient according to sex, age, nationality (heredity), health, temperament, environment, mental ability and social adjustment, and, third reëducation.

In all cases of stuttering as well as in the more severe cases of mal-articulation, the factors of self-consciousness and nervousness are always present and the sufferer must therefore be treated with utmost gentleness, kindness and tact.

Under the physiologic heading for stuttering we find in the first place disturbances of breathing. The psychophysical symptoms are those physiologic changes which are associated with or conditioned on alterations in mental states, changes which have to do with processes not directly related with the function of speech. The reëducational treatment then must be both disciplinary or educational and medical.

Under the types of speech disturbances that demand articulation reëducation, the forms that are most prevalent in our public schools and which need the careful adjustment in the earliest stages, are those of lisping due either to tongue protrusion or the substitution of a sound for *s, z, sh, zh, ch, j.* The course to pursue in the correction of these mispronunciations would be various, depending upon the mental concepts, the clearness of hearing, the acceptance of fine detail, the control of breath, the adjustment of the delicate tongue contacts for these sounds, and upon the study of comparisons. Lateral lisps on these sounds are caused by the misdirection of the air on the top of the tongue, which misses its central course and slides over to one or both sides of the tongue. Usually these lateral lisps require quite some attention to the setting up of a distraction, for the patient becomes very self-conscious when drilled upon the mouth gymnastics necessary for the correction. If melody on a vowel could be induced by using the word many times without the offending consonant and gradually slipping in the initial S or Z, much of the air stream will be directed away from this noisy difficulty. For infantile speech, the corrective measures will be mostly through imitation, but may be supplemented by very careful work with a tongue applicator touched to the very tip of the tongue several times before the pronunciation of words like *say, soup and soap.*

For the patient with foreign accent, beside the phonetic and scientific study of the new language, the exercises must be calculated to reëducate his ear, his attitude toward inflection both on words and thoughts. Sluggish, indistinct enunciation requires much drilling upon elementary sounds as reëducative processes for

the speech mechanism, but the main work will be in character building. Tense speech, where not due to any hereditary disease, may be relaxed through jaw and lip exercises. With a voice noticeably harsh, weak, shrill, hoarse, monotonous or disagreeable, there is usually a lack of resonance, but this fact in itself is only the result of some underlying cause which, if not found by the laryngologist, may lie in some mental attitude that prevents the right use of the motor, or vibrator, or resonator or articulator.

The affectations of speech, or speech mannerisms, such as gasping, slurring, clipping words, use of unnecessary words, all present a field for psychological training, and each individual should have that special attention which will fill his particular needs. There are many nervous disorders of speech organs such as harelip and cleft palate, imperfect speech through deafness and partial deafness, hereditary tendencies toward muscular incoördinations and the weakened conditions attendant upon the children's diseases; all of which would require idividual reëducation.

The speech reëducator must recognize that he is to prescribe for each disturbance of speech according to the needs of the individual. There are fundamental helps that may be given every one, either in a class in school or in a clinic that if done in concert might strengthen the "will to do," the courage, the poise and the character; but for each special speech disturbance some special aid must be given. Thus for the cleft palate cases, much time, patience and energy must be devoted to the reëducation of the muscles around the cleft and those of the nose, the ear must be retrained, the breathing must be readjusted so that air does not all escape through the nose. For this much practice should be given to holding the nostrils tightly closed with two fingers while the vowels are clearly enunciated over and over again. We have not attempted in this paper to touch upon the intensive training to be given to the case whose speech spasticity requires a painstaking reëducation that can hardly be done by anyone not acquainted with the neuroanatomy of the human system. The reëducation of speech after poliomyelitis is also the specialist's particular care, as are the speech difficulties resulting from brain injuries, etc.

Investigations made by R. L. Jones of the Smithsonian Institution reveal the fact that the speech energy of the voice is only 125 ergs a second—an almost infinitesimally small amount of power.

Thus the energy of a million persons all talking at once would not boil a cup of tea in an hour. It wouldn't generate enough energy to carry home a pound of butter, or to peal an orange. This fact is of particular interest in the reëducation of the stutterer, and means that relaxation is the aim of all our methods, whether we voice a method or not.

Experiments conducted by Dr. John B. Watson at Johns Hopkins and Columbia Universities have shown that infants at birth show fear only at a loud noise or sudden loss of support and have to learn to fear all other things. Since fear is after all an acquired reaction, and since it has been definitely established that the mind is capable of containing but one strong emotion at a time, it will be seen that by filling the mind with one great enthusiasm there will be no room for fear. Insistence upon concentration and association of ideas in relation to the reëducation of speech will enable the stutterer to so fill his mind with enthusiasm for correct speech that his fear will vanish.

The necessity of attempting to solve the problem of speech defects shows itself in the following facts: 1, speech disorders are common and serious; 2, they are often the concomitant of hereditary disease; 3, they often produce nervous disorders; and, 4, they handicap many for life.

Speech disorders should not be allowed to be common and serious. If the parent has not discovered that the child's speech is defective and it is sent to school with defective speech, whether resulting from negligence, disease, fear, fright or conflict of language, it is the teacher's duty to discover the defect and if unable to give remedy himself, to see that the child is sent where it can be helped. Speech training is a most important aid in moral training for the relation of speech to thinking, the substitution of good habits for bad, self-criticism, self-mastery, self-realization, development of will power, all bring about a conscious control. The fundamental technique of speech without its technical terms should be taught to all children in order to overcome self-consciousness. It should not be necessary to go to a teacher of elocution to learn that tongue consonants are made with the moving of the tongue and not the jaw; nor to the teacher of music to learn that the mouth must be open to produce good round sounds.

Right here a word of caution may be given. There are too

many teachers who seek to rule their classrooms by fear. They constantly try to crush the spirits of the little ones by means of loud, shrill tones. To be perfectly candid, we should ourselves be brought to a state of nervous exhaustion if compelled to sit daily for hours and listen to some voices heard in classrooms, often, to be sure, the result of weariness and overwork.

Children are infinitely more emotional than adults. It has been said that the progress from birth to old age is marked by a constant diminution of the emotional powers. When you are under the influence of your emotions your speech is affected. For instance, how well known are the expressions "dumfounded with surprise," "inexpressibly delighted," "speechless with grief." Multiply a hundredfold the influence of the emotions on your speech and you will approximate the influence of the emotions on the speech of children. Conditions which do not arouse your emotions in the least will stir those of a child to the utmost. In a good many cases of defective speech, we must seek a cure in the proper training of the emotions—self-control.

There is a marked increase in the number of cases of speech defects, notably stuttering, shortly after the beginning of school life. The increasing demand of the public for practical results, in a material sense, crowds in upon the teacher. The crowded classrooms with their mixture of races, the curriculum that demands so much ground to be covered and the atmosphere of constraint and haste, develop in both teacher and pupil an attitude of tension and impatience that shows itself often in nervous tones of speech and often engenders defects. We need to let down, and to take the time to speak slowly and distinctly; thus giving the teacher an opportunity to give careful attention not only to her own speaking voice—for her tones give the atmosphere to the classroom more than any other single factor—but also to those of the pupils.

Up to the time that a child enters school, he usually enjoys absolute freedom of speech. Whatever comes to his mind he is at liberty to express. Not so in school. With the large classes and the rigid requirements of curriculum, such freedom is almost impossible. This condition persists during school life and becomes worse as the child advances, so that when he reaches college he finds that the teacher does all the talking and he has only to listen and write. There are some writers who say that the effort exercised

to keep silent constitutes a valuable part of moral training. If that be so, how much greater would the moral value be of keeping one's eyes closed for the greater part of one's waking time? The plain, undeniable, vital fact is that self-expression is essential; repression is baneful—especially in the matter of speech. The answer will be that children have opportunity to indulge their desire to speak after school hours. But we want to teach correct speech, which as a rule is not heard out of school. Let this, then, be the rule of conduct in classrooms: Plenty of oral work; no unnecessary repression.

In conclusion, the reëducation of speech tests and trains knowledge, thinking power, and language power. But beyond all of these it trains personal qualities of confidence, poise, courtesy, self-control, emotional adjustment and understanding of human nature, in a way that cannot be remotely approached in any other part of the educational program.

Good voice good utterance, freedom, ease, poise, power, attractiveness, in speech, are assets whose value cannot be disputed. The lack of them closes many attractive avenues to success and happiness in life—business, professional, social—for boys and girls every year.

Teachers, students and patients alike should so familiarize themselves with the following Ten Commandments of Speech that proper and correct speech may be assured at all times:

1. Say to yourself "I have no fear. I know that I can speak well."
2. Think before you speak.
3. Always speak quietly and calmly, with all the muscles relaxed.
4. Always speak slowly and carefully.
5. Stand and sit quietly and erect when speaking.
6. Before speaking inhale quietly and without straining, with the mouth slightly open.
7. Be very careful of the first two words in each sentence.
8. Always lengthen and strengthen the principal vowels.
9. Be especially careful to lengthen the so-called short vowels.
10. Be honest with yourself. Do not try to avoid words that you think difficult.

VITAL CAPACITY AND ABILITY IN ORAL READING

JOHN BARNES
University of Wisconsin

The term "vital capacity," as used by physiologists, indicates "the maximum of air an individual is able to expel from the lungs by voluntary effort, after taking the deepest possible inspiration."[1]

It might be assumed that, as breath is the medium of voice, ability in oral reading is conditioned to some extent upon vital capacity. To determine whether such an assumption is valid, a reading test was given to 124 men from Public Speaking classes in the University of Wisconsin and their vital capacity measured. All the men in nine different classes were used in the experiment. The women in these classes were not included in the test but they took part in judging the reading done by the men. There were tested:

2 groups of 10 men
1 group of 12 men
1 group of 13 men
1 group of 14 men
3 groups of 16 men
1 group of 17 men

The procedure for the reading test was as follows: The passage from Thurston's *Plea for Cuba*, quoted below, was read by each subject:

"We cannot intervene and save Cuba without the exercise of force, and force means war; war means blood. The lowly Nazarene on the shores of Galilee preached the divine doctrine of love, "Peace on earth, good will toward men." Not peace on earth at the expense of liberty and humanity. Not good will toward men who despoil, enslave, degrade, and starve to death their fellowmen. I believe in the doctrine of Christ. I believe in the doctrine of peace; but men must have liberty before there can come abiding peace. When has a battle for humanity and liberty ever been won except by force? What barricade of wrong, injustice, and oppression has ever been carried except by force?

"Force compelled the signature of unwilling royalty to the great Magna Charta; force put life into the Declaration of Independence and made effective the Emancipation Proclamation; force waved the flag of

[1]Georges Dreyer, *Assessment of Physical Fitness*, p. 7.

revolution over Bunker Hill and marked the snows of Valley Forge with blood-stained feet; force held the broken line of Shiloh, climbed the flame-swept hill at Chattanooga, and stormed the clouds on Lookout Heights; force marched with Sherman to the sea, rode with Sheridan in the Valley of the Shenandoah, and gave Grant victory at Appomattox; force saved the Union, kept the stars in the flag, made 'niggers' men. The time for God's force has come again. Let the impassioned lips of American patriots once more take up the song:

> **In the beauty of the lilies Christ was born across the sea,**
> **With a glory in His bosom that transfigures you and me.**
> **As He died to make men holy, let us die to make men free,**
> **For God is marching on."**

This passage was selected because, if properly read, it necessitates a strong tone and a sustained effort, both of which have often been considered as conditioned upon large lung capacity. It was thought that, if a correlation existed between vital capacity and ability in oral reading, it could be discovered in the reading of such a vigorous passage. At the last meeting of the class prior to the test, a mimeographed sheet was given each student containing the paragraphs selected, together with a short descriptive statement by the instructor, intended to give an adequate setting for the lines to be read. The instructor then read the selection himself, and urged special study of the lines preparatory to the test.

Each subject read from a reading-stand in the rear of the room, unseen by the class. For the purpose of grading the readers, each student was given a mimeographed grade sheet containing the following instructions:

"In this test please judge the reading ability of each participant as accurately as possible, giving the best reader 100 per cent and the poorest 50 per cent. Range the others at such intervals on the scale as best represent their respective abilities. Judge only on what you hear. Do not turn to observe the reader. Do not allow the memory of previous work done by him enter into your judgment."

The vital capacity of each student was measured by means of the wet spirometer. Three trials were given and the largest displacement recorded. The mean reading grade and the actual vital capacity for each of the 124 subjects were recorded in columns 2 and 7 respectively of the accompanying table. From these data three separate computations were made according to three different methods of treating the data.

FIRST

In order to standardize the vital capacity data, two other measurements were taken—the body weight (including ordinary clothing) and the sitting height (measured from the top of the head to the base of the vertebral column). The latter was done by having the subject sit on the floor with his back to a door and his knees slightly drawn up to allow the base of the vertebral column to rest on the floor. By means of a square, and a graduated metric scale on the door, the sitting height was measured.[2] Dr. Dreyer has tabulated the normal vital capacity corresponding to body weight for three classes of Englishmen listed as A, B, C. As the normal vital capacity of Class A (army and navy personnel, police force, athletes, and active sportsmen, blacksmiths and boilermakers) approximated the actual vital capacity of our students tested, the data relative to Class A only are used in the tabulation. In our computation, Dreyer's estimate of normal vital capacity according to body weight was added to his estimate of normal vital capacity according to sitting height and the sum divided by two to establish a mean which might be considered a more reliable standard than that derived from sitting height or body weight alone. The actual vital capacity of each student was then divided by this normal mean for a man of his body weight and sitting height. The sum of these 124 quotients was substituted for "b" in the formula.

A reference to the tabulated data will clarify this explanation. For example, in the reading grades (column 1) Konnak has an average of 96.64 per cent. His sitting height (column 4) is 88.4 centimeters and, according to Dreyer, the normal vital capacity for a man of that sitting height is 4042 cubic centimeters. Konnak's weight is 132 pounds (column 5) and, according to Dreyer, the normal vital capacity for a man of that weight is 3988 cubic centimeters. Adding 4042 and 3988 and dividing by 2, we have 4015 cubic centimeters (column 6) as the mean normal vital capacity for a man of Konnak's weight and sitting height. But Konak's actual vital capacity (column 7) is 3753 cubic centimeters. By dividing Konnak's actual vital capacity by the standard mean for such a man, we have the quotient .93. The total of the 124 quotients in column 8 was substituted for "b" in the formula and the total

[2]Georges Dreyer, *Assessment of Physical Fitness*, p. 6.

TABLE OF DATA FOR FIVE OUT OF ONE HUNDRED TWENTY-FOUR SUBJECTS

Column 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
NAME	Average per cent in reading grades	Transmutted reading grades	Actual sitting ht. of subject in centimeters and corresponding vital capacity in cc. according to Dreyer	Actual wt. of subject in lbs. and corresponding vital capacity according to Dreyer	Mean vital capacity as estimated from Dreyer	Actual vital capacity of subject	Quotient from col. 7 divided by column 6	Interpolation of column 8
Konnak	96.64	92.33	88.4 c. 4042 cc.	132 3988	4015	3753	0.93	.133
Erickson	88.27	87.19	83.0 3506	143 4225	3865	4200	1.09	.666
Elkins	86.36	86.02	88.0 4001	168 4744	4372	4600	1.05	.533
Sharratt	85.18	85.29	90.6 4273	157 4519	4396	4800	1.09	.666
Sorenson	80.00	82.11	88.0 4001	178 4946	4473	4050	0.91	.066

of the mean grades in column 2 was substituted for "a" in the formula.

(It is interesting to note here that these 124 "mine run" students have an actual mean vital capacity 173 cubic centimeters above the normal mean for Dreyer's Class A Englishmen).

For the correlations we used the following variant Pearson's formula:

$$\frac{M\,ab \;-\; (Ma \times Mb)}{\sqrt{M\,a^2 - M^2\,a}\qquad\sqrt{M\,b^2 - M^2\,b}}$$

Substituting in this formula the corresponding numerical data, we have:

$$r = \frac{80.83 \;-\; (78.18 \times 1.03)}{\sqrt{6242.10 - 6112.11}\qquad\sqrt{1.14 - 1.09}}$$

$$r = +\,.11$$

SECOND

Column 9 is an interpolation of column 8. The values were obtained in the following manner: Quotient .89 is the smallest and quotient 1.19 is the largest in this particular group of ten. Considering 1.19 as 1, and .89 as 0, all the other quotients of the group

have values between 0 and 1. The other eight groups were similarly interpolated. The total of column 9 was substituted for "b" in the formula, to be used with the total in column 2 for a second correlation of the original data. Using the same formula as before, we have:

$$r = \frac{38.65 - (78.18 \times .49)}{\sqrt{6242.10 - 6112.11} \quad \sqrt{.39 - .24}}$$

$$r = +.08$$

THIRD

The third computation is a direct correlation between the actual vital capacity (column 7) and the reading grades transmuted (column 3) according to Hull's formula[3] for standardizing such groups of grades. Substituting in the Pearson formula the data thus derived, we have:

$$5r = \frac{36271.13 - (81.03 \times 447.41)}{\sqrt{6609.57 - (81.03)^2} \times \sqrt{203372.04 - (447.41)^2}}$$

$$r = +.05$$

According to three different methods of computation we have arrived at practically the same results, + .11, + .08, + .05. For each of these computations the probable error of correlation was calculated and found to be .0598, .0602, and .0605 respectively; all of which implies that the correlation between vital capacity and ability in oral reading is insignificant.

This negligible correlation is on a par with the findings of Miss Alice Brownell of the Physical Education Department of the University of Wisconsin. In students of this department we might expect to find high correlations between vital capacity and various abilities. Out of about 300 women students, Miss Brownell selected 120 on a basis of high tests in scholarship, health, agility, coördination, and right hand grip. From this group of 120 she chose 40 at random for correlations. Her findings were as follows:

Scholarship and vital capacity	.10
Health and vital capacity	.08
Agility and vital capacity	.04
Coördination and vital capacity	.08
Right hand grip	.35

[3] $X = K + SX$. Wisconsin Publications in Experimental Psychology. Vol. II.

The very low correlations[4] between vital capacity and ability in oral reading may possibly be explained as follows: We know that very little breath is actually used in the production of tone, even of vigorous tone. It is doubtless true that, considering only the physical basis of oral reading, muscular control over the organs controlling the breath that we do use is of very much greater importance than vital capacity.

But what about Miss Brownell's findings? We certainly might expect a high correlation between large lung capacity and health, but the actual correlation is insignificant. Right hand grip and vital capacity have a more significant correlation of .35. This fact is readily explained by Dreyer's conclusions, that body weight and sitting height are closely correlated with vital capacity; for we know that, in general, the tall, heavy person possesses correspondingly great strength. Hence the necessity for an appreciable correlation between right hand grip and vital capacity.

The combined studies of Dr. Dreyer, Miss Brownell, and myself suggest that vital capacity is probably not closely correlated with any abilities except those directly dependent upon bodily size and weight; that vital capacity bears a more or less constant ratio to the bulk of the body; that it is developed unconsciously to meet an increasing metabolism due to increased physical activity.

Now if it is true that we are born with vital capacities designed to meet the needs of the metabolism of bodies of our particular size and weight, and that these capacities are unconsciously developed according to the needs of our habitual physical activities; and if it is true, as physiologists now maintain, that the blood stream stimulates and controls the nervous center for breathing in accordance with our need for oxygen, the practical question arises, Why attempt consciously to develop lung capacity for reading and speaking? Here I quote from J. F. Williams,[5] M. D., Columbia University:

"The use of breathing exercises to increase the size of the lungs and chest, unless used for corrective or therapeutic purposes in individual or prescribed-for cases, is unscientific and dangerous. Lung development should be an expression of increased respiration need. . . It would be as irrational to develop a large heart out of

[4] An absolute correlation is expressed by the integer I.

[5] *Personal Hygiene Applied*, by J. F. Williams.

proportion to the rest of the body as it is to develop large lungs without reference to body needs."

With physiologists in agreement with this pronouncement, to what extent is it necessary for teachers of speech to modify their theories and practice for vocal training?

VITALIZING THE COURSE OF STUDY IN ARGUMENTATION AND DEBATE*

W. ARTHUR CABLE
University of Arizona

NOT long ago, after a dull and uninteresting debate between two state universities, a colleague said to me, "Cable, I'm going to make a prediction. Let us both take note, and see if it comes true. The time is soon coming, say in ten or fifteen years, when there'll be no such thing as inter-collegiate debating, as we know it today."

Whether his remark predicted a dying out of intercollegiate debating activities or a fundamental change in manner, matter and method, it is not my purpose to argue. But in either event the curricular work offered in argumentation and debate must be held to some extent responsible.

At the outset may I suggest that by "course of study" I would have us think especially of *a series of courses*, not simply of one course in argumentation and debate. And possibly we should proceed one step farther and admit that, if this study neglects any type of higher educational institution, it is the small college where only one course in the subject may be expedient.

My purpose has been to suggest some factors which would seem to be involved in a vitalization of the course of study in argumentation and debate, and to consider the direction in which the whole should point. As a complementary step a certain degree of inquiry has also been made into present conditions and methods of curricular work. The two phases, however, are not separated in this study.

*Prepared for the New York convention of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, December 31, 1925.

In establishing a proper background for the consideration of this question, let us look to the aims and objectives which should characterize the course of study. Should the curricular work in argumentation and debate be considered first and foremost a stepping stone to contest debating? Should the aim primarily be the preparation of college students for intercollegiate debating teams? Or should the dominant aim be preparation for life; for effective adult life; for the most influential practical adult participation in argumentative and persuasive discussion? Or are the two statements of aim synonymous?

I think not, for various reasons. The former leads to concentration of effort on the training of the few, the latter encourages the training of the many. The former seeks to develop the few with exceptional native ability, to the neglect of those of average or low ability; the latter distributes effort over the entire group. The former, in effect, makes contest debating, if not the *winning* of such debates, an end in itself; the latter looks upon it only as a means to an end. These are some of the reasons why I think you will say that they are statements of two distinctly different aims.

But which objective should we embrace? the one which trains the few to a high degree of skill *at the expense of the many*, or the one which wisely distributes effort and training universally? the specialized situation, or the average, normal situation? the one which trains for what some have called "an unreal situation," which most students will seldom if ever meet in after years, or the one which aims directly at efficient, everyday, adult life? Soundness of judgment again drives us to "the greatest good to the greatest number," to the objective which aims at fitness for the average life-situation.

We may gain something from noting for a moment the aims of the American college, for certainly we must ally ourselves and our objectives with the whole of which we are a part. Franklin Bobbitt, of the School of Education of the University of Chicago, in his book, *How to Make a Curriculum*, page 7, makes this statement:

> **"Education is to prepare men and women for the activities of every kind which make up, or which ought to make up, well-rounded adult life, . . . it has no other purpose, . . . everything should be done with a view single to the purpose, . . . nothing should be included which does not serve this purpose."**

Again, let us notice the observation and conclusion of Dr. Frederick J. Kelly, Dean of Administration in the University of Minnesota, who made a careful and extensive study of college curricula, methods and objectives. In his book *The American Arts College,* pages 19 and 20, he indicates general agreement among catalogs, college deans, and faculty committees that there are "three fairly distinct functions of the college: preparatory, cultural or non-vocational, and vocational." In other words, the aims are: "the mastery of the tools of learning," including both the speaking and writing of the mother tongue; "the assimilation of culture, learning to live better as a member of the family, community, state, nation and the world;" and preparation "for earning a living."

Summarizing, and applying our deductions to the teaching of argumentation and debate, we as teachers of the subject must recognize our responsibility for teaching students:

a. To think clearly.
b. To reason soundly (not only logically).
c. To talk convincingly.

We must recognize the two phases of the subject, often referred to as *theory* and *practice,* but which I prefer to designate as *knowledge* and *skill.*

We must recognize and teach materials of argumentative theory as a preparation for life: for example, certain rules of a good proposition, as that it should be single, unambiguous, *et cetera;* the process and results of analysis; the kinds of and tests for evidence; the kinds of arguments; and the field of refutation applying to the purposes in hand; the rules on the proposition, detecting weak or faulty analysis, testing evidence, attacking the forms of arguments, pointing out fallacies in arguments, and employing special refutory devices.

Now, ignoring many aspects and points that it would be both interesting and profitable to discuss, and cutting to the heart of the question, I bring three indictments against much of the college work in argumentation and debate: It is inadequate in amount, it does not afford a thoro training, and it develops faulty and undesirable habits and attitudes of mind. Or, stated constructively and with a forward look: The course of study should be developed in extensity, it should likewise be developed in in-

tensity, and the methods of teaching should be altered to decrease or eliminate undesirable mental characteristics, such as intolerance, biased mental attitude, and allied traits, and to cultivate a spirit of fair play, unprejudiced attitude, open-mindedness, a desire to search after the whole truth.

I

To say that the course of study in argumentation and debate should be developed in extent seems almost a platitude, in the light of our desire to turn out students well-trained both in knowledge and skill. In most of the smaller colleges one course, for a semester or a year, is the extent of the classwork in the subject—and the same condition has not been wholly unheard-of in some of our largest universities. Neither will the true situation always be shown by scanning the list of courses announced in the catalog! Is it necessary to remark the unreasonableness of expecting students to become well-grounded in the theory of argumentation, skilled in its application to the situations of oral discussion and debate, and proficient in the art of effective speaking, all within the limits of one brief course, meeting possibly twice a week? Yet numbers of students go out from the colleges and universities of America each year, saying, "Yes, yes; I had a course in argumentation and debate!" and straightway proceed to demonstrate that they had exactly what they said they had: "a" course. Effectiveness in a given field comes from long contact with the materials of that field. Tho the instructor be a master teacher, tho the subject-matter be presented and the course be conducted in the most approved and efficient manner, yet the human mind is slow to grasp the significance of the materials with which it deals.[1] And the field of argumentation and debate, we agree unanimously, yields no sluggard's task. It calls for all the resources of the living man—for a profundity of knowledge and a readiness of skill not formed within the limits of a twelve-month.

During the course of the past autumn, in order to make a

[1] Witness the fact in business and the professions, in the halls of the legislatures, in the ranks of the profession of teaching. And these are adult minds at work, with a more or less extended experience, and with the demands of adult life spurring them on to success. Remove these conditions and the relatively quicker retention of the young mind will not compensate for them.

preliminary test of the information and suggestion that might be available in connection with my general subject, I wrote to the directors of debating in 60 of the leading universities of America, and to 100 members of Delta Sigma Rho, national honorary forensic fraternity, carefully selected to show a geographical and chronological cross-section of argumentation and debate experience in American colleges in recent years. 42 teachers and 51 fraternity members replied.

In connection with the need for more classwork in argumentation and debate, it is significant to note that, of 42 replies from Delta Sigma Rho men to the question, "Do you think you had as much classwork as you needed in argumentation and debate?" 15 replied "yes" and 28, or about two out of every three persons, replied "no." In reply to the question, "Did you take all such courses offered in your college?" out of a total of 42 replies, 10 said "no" and 32, or more than three out of every four persons, said they did take all such courses offered when they were in college. Two out of every three said they needed more such courses; three out of every four said they took all they could get, and many of them said they needed more! In answer to the inquiry as to how much they did take, one-third answered "one course" and another third "two courses." From 42 universities came the report of a total of 79 courses in the field of argumentation and debate listed in their catalogs, of which 31 were semester courses and 31 were year courses. The remainder were twelve-weeks' courses. Of the 42 universities, 31 reported, 2, 1, or no courses listed in the catalog; counting an intercollegiate debate seminar as a regular course in institutions in which it was offered, 13 of the universities listed one course in the subject, and 4 offered no course, while three others offer no course during 1925-26. Thus a total of 7 out of 42, or one out of every six of the universities reporting, offer no course in argumentation and debate during the current year. Three of these seven universities have a total enrollment each of from 4100 to 7000, none of them with less than 1500 students in the College of Liberal Arts and one of them numbering well above 3000 in that college.

Looking at the report from the point of view of semester hours offered, 15 of the 42 universities offer 4 hours or less of argumentation and debate.

At this point someone may ask, "what would you add to the course of study? How would you increase the amount of work offered?" The answer which follows is suggested not as in any way original, but only as a reminder of the goal toward which we are all looking. Two principles should guide the enlargement of the course of study: the addition of courses in argumentation and debate proper, and correlation with other college work, both within and without the Department of Speech. With these principles in mind, and ignoring the element of administrative policy regulating any particular university, I present:

A SUGGESTED COURSE OF STUDY IN ARGUMENTATION AND DEBATE

I. Allied public speaking courses:
   a. The Principles of Speaking (Basic course, prerequisite.)
   b. Speech Composition
   c. Advanced Public Speaking
   d. Persuasion in Public Address
II. Argumentation and debate:
   a. Introductory course in argumentation and debate
   b. Logic
   c. Advanced Argumentation and Debate
   d. Argumentative Speaking
   e. Legal and Political Argumentation
   f. Research courses and seminars in argumentation
   g. The History of Argumentation and of Argumentative Oratory
III. Correlative courses in other departments:
   a. The social sciences
      1. Political Economy
      2. Political Science
      3. History
      4. Sociology
   b. Psychology
      1. Principles of Psychology
      2. The psychology of speech and public speaking
      3. Persuasion
      4. Emotion and action
      5. The thought processes
      6. The audience and the crowd
      7. Laboratory or experimental psychology
   c. English
      1. Grammar
      2. Composition
      3. Literature

In connection with the last-named of these general divisions,

that of correlative courses in other departments of college instruction, it may be of interest at this point to refer to a question I asked directors of debating: "Are students encouraged, as a part of the course of study in argumentation and debate, to take courses in logic, social sciences, psychology, English?" 36 answers to this question were received from universities in which debating is offered, only 7 specifying that no such guidance was offered the students in their institutions. 25 replied with an unqualified affirmative; one said "yes, in logic, psychology and English;" one "yes, in logic, social sciences and psychology (English is required):" one "yes, in law;" and one "yes, in psychology." In 29 of the universities this guidance is offered by the instructor in the classroom; in two of these 29, also by the dean or the faculty advisor; and in 7 of them also by printed announcement in the catalog.

"But," I hear someone say in regard to this suggested course of study, "you are heading all this up, the entire Department of Speech and the whole college, from your own pet point of view and the subject you teach." My reply is that it is my business to do so. That is the business of every teacher, is it not? and the worker in any field—to make the *universe* contribute to his work? Does not the teacher of dramaics the same? or the teacher of speech science, or what-not? Is not that one of the earmarks of creative teaching?

"But who," it may be asked, "would take all these courses? How are you going to fill your classes?" The pre-law students, if the courses are good, will want all of them they can get. The "pre-medics" will need the training in their profession. The engineering students will need sometime to convince a board of directors that their plans are good and desirable. The commerce students, and the entire sales profession and occupation, need the training. The education students, who are soon to become teachers, will desire it. Some of the courses will be open to graduate students. And some will be given in alternate years. Speech work, when properly presented to him, is of interest to the average student. He will use it in practically any walk of life which he may take up. At first he may remark concerning Speech as did the engineering freshman at Iowa regarding English: "Naw; us engineers don't need no grammar;" but soon he will see the

light. He will use it in his daily life. I have heard, as doubtless you have heard, students *beg* for more work, more courses, in public speaking and in the field of argumentation and debate.

Do not misunderstand me. I do not imply that all colleges and universities can at once adopt as extensive a course of study as that here suggested. But all can work in that direction, and the large universities I think can quickly develop such a course. Given the impetus, with good courses and good teaching, and the work in journalism or in dramatics jumps from an elementary course or two to a well-developed series. Given the same degree of impetus and attention, I think a course of study in argumentation and debate can be developed nearly as rapidly. The work in several large universities this year seems to bear out the truth of this statement.

II

The second proposition was that students should be more intensively trained; or in other words, that the course of study in argumentation and debate should be developed in *intensity*. This is a question of thoroughness of teaching and training, and virtally affects the future welfare of the profession. In the questions to Delta Sigma Rho members was one asking, "What were the weak points in your training?" The courses under consideration are not, in many instances, being taught with the thoroughness that should characterize them. Many of us can draw upon our own experience for support of this statement. If you will pardon the personal reference, I cite my own case, in which not even a semester course, but a *twelve-weeks'* course in argumentation and debate, was given. Referring to the replies from members of Delta Sigma Rho, we find a lack of training in logical theory and a lack of practice in speaking or in some phase of presentation each mentioned an equal number of times, and leading all the other weaknesses in training mentioned. With the former, for the obvious reason that ability to analyze is largely the result of training in theory, were counted a lack of training in analysis, twice mentioned. Following these the point next often mentioned was a want of attention to the persuasive side, or as one man, a chemistry teacher, put it, "no idea of swaying an audience rather than judges; no color;" "too little human"—this from a college dean—and "lack of emphasis on humanness," from a lawyer. A commercial engi-

neer hit at the same weakness in these words: "The usual course in argumentation and debate does not give sufficient attention to the reactions of your opponent—it has too much in mind the reactions of an impartial third party. In practical life there is no such third party."

Other weaknesses specified were: incompetent instructors and poor teaching; lack of classes; brevity of courses; too much theory without practical application; general lack of interest on the part of the school administration; lack of correlation with other departments; lack of training in the use of voice and action.

It is interesting to note that the point of strength far and away most often mentioned was practice in speaking, or some phase of presentation. Logical theory was mentioned by only three people. This fact is not only interesting, it is significant of my earlier contention that stress has too often been placed on practice debating to the neglect of the knowledge side. I am not decrying practice in speaking; I am trying to emphasize the importance of training in logical theory as *a part* of the work to be offered. I am urging that emphasis be divided between argumentative logic and practice in argumentative speaking. In answer to the question as to whether the classwork was mostly the theory of argumentation, or practice in debating, or fairly evenly divided, out of 41 answers 24 reported "divided," 11 "mostly practice," and 6 "mostly theory." But of 40 replies as to their familiarity with the items of logical theory when they had finished the courses, 18 said "no," 14 said "fairly," "to some extent," or "in part," and 10 said "yes." Now I should like to question the thoroughness of a course or series of courses in which practically half the students, when they have finished it, disclaim familiarity with the knowledge materials of it, and only twenty-five percent can report familiarity; in which a weakness in the theory of argumentation and a weakness in speaking go hand in hand as by far the leading criticisms of the work taken.

These facts lead us to the conclusion that a greater degree of standardization is advisable, in which a wholesome balance is struck among the various phases of the subject. But "there's the rub." What *is* a wholesome balance? Who shall say how much logical theory, how much study and analysis of written arguments, how much brief-drawing, how much speech composition, how much

persuasion, how much practice in speaking, with intelligent criticism, shall be given? These are the phases I think should be represented, the parts that make up the whole, by whatever names various individuals may wish to designate them. And the appointment of the time and amount of effort to the various phases I think must be made by a joint contribution of teachers of the subject, by former students of the courses, in view of their later experiences in adult life, and by the applied psychologist.

At the time I sketched this paper and prepared my inquiries to debating teachers and to members of Delta Sigma Rho I did not know that Professor Sanford was also doing similar research. And yet our work, I think, supplements very nicely. He tells us how teachers of argumentation and debate actually apportion their work; while former students of the subject have enumerated for me the ways in which the classwork in argumentation and debate has helped them in more efficient adult life.

Among the ways mentioned in the returns which I received, analysis and analytic reasoning lead all the rest, with clear and logical thinking only one point behind. Among those who enumerated the former, however, one man specified that it was as a result of teaching argumentation and debate, not of the classwork when he was a student. Closely allied to both of these points was one reply that it helped the man to "quick, independent thinking."

"Public speaking" was mentioned, either in these or equivalent words, by the next highest number, eight people; while in this general class would fall various factors of presentation: "to express myself clearly," or "clearly and easily" was given by two persons; "conciseness" by two; and "to talk logically" by two; while "to express myself forcefully," "effective expression," and "verbal readiness and platform poise" were given by one each.

Seven people gave either "self-confidence" or ability to think on my feet" or both. Four mentioned, in effect, the development of a tendency to look on both sides of a question, one saying, "It made me less assertive, and more charitable toward the views of others." "It made me more critical of dogmatic statements," said another; "broadmindedness," said a third.

A like number spoke of its value to them in social discourse. Three mentioned its general value in their profession of law, while another specified briefing and the writing of arguments. One re-

ferred to its value to him in business conferences; one, in fraternal contacts.

Four mentioned various phases of speech composition—finding material, arrangement, outlining. One man—and may his tribe increase—replied, "It has prevented me from speaking when I had nothing to say, and taught me when to quit talking;" another, "brevity," a third, "to express opinions only on matters about which I am informed and in support of which there are facts or correct reasoning." "A desire to be a little better prepared and informed than the other fellow," said a fourth, while a fifth reported "a realization that hard work is necessary."

One answered, "a tendency to defend a conviction," another, "ready rebuttal."

Finally, one man replied, "general rather than specific," another "very little," and two indicated that they "gained much more from debating on the team than from class work;" "class work not much help."

I am happy to close this phase of the report from the questionnaire with the statement of a man who graduated fifteen years ago from one of the middle western universities, a statement which happly evaluates the training as a preparation for life: "I consider my work in those classes—brief and unsatisfactory as it was—invaluable. I believe that every university student should be required to take some work along those lines. Foreign languages, dead or live, chemistry, etc., etc., may be valuable; but the knowledge of them does not enable one to put over a business transaction in the face of determined opposition."

Do not these replies, from such widely variant sources, emphasize again the importance of a well-balanced course of study comprising logical theory, its application to the problems of actual argumentative discussion and debate, and a training in effective public speaking?

III

Our third proposition was that the course of study in argumentation and debate should cultivate an unprejudiced and open-minded attitude in a search after truth: a judicial point of view in giving due weight to arguments and evidence wherever and in whatever form they may appear.

Notice the basic attitude often shown by the debater toward

the question under discussion. He is in a partisan frame of mind. He may have studied both sides of the question, but he *sees* only one side. His mind appears to be impervious to the truths on the other side, and the error and faults that he has found he grasps in a death-clutch not unlike that of the proverbial drowning man. He may be reasoning logically, but its basic soundness may sometimes be called in question. He may pile up evidence, but apparently he has sometimes neglected to test it—or is he taking a chance that the "other side" will pass it unnoticed? He is a partisan, with a partisan's narrowed and warped attitude, calling everything either white or black, as it does or does not fit in with his "case." He is there to prove his point, and he is not going to do it by halves. His motto is, "Let the judge decide."

Now I claim that this is a faulty attitude, not preparing, but handicapping one for the most effective adult life. Truth is many-sided, and truth doubtless often has some error mixed in with it. Things are not either black or white: when we get the right kind of spectacles we usually find that they are more or less gray. We are reminded of Bacon's admonition, in substance: Read not to contradict or take for granted, but to weigh and consider;[2] and the thought comes that a dash of that philosophy would not be bad for some college debating teams who mistake a glibness of speech and a force of expression for effective argumentation and debate.

And the attitude of this type of debater toward his oppenents! The contest idea is so thoroughly woven into American life and thinking that *winning* often seems more important than other values. It reminds me of some remarks in the leading article in the January "Harper's," by Dr. Joseph Collins, in his article "Childish Americans:" "My house is bigger than yours"—"My doll can talk and yours can't"—"My father can lick yours any day." You ask a student if he is going out for debating, and he says, "Do you think I have any chance to "make" the team?" You tell him that he has, and he asks, "How many debates did this school win last year?"

This situation, be it said in fairness, is rapidly changing in many institutions; but it is an educational process, which must

[2]"Read not to contradict and confute; nor to believe and take for granted; nor to find talk and discourse: but to weigh and consider."—Bacon's Essays: "Of Studies."

be worked down into the high school. Until such time as that is accomplished, we must continue the process of re-education of incoming college students to a more wholesome point of view. The ideal is very well expressed, it seems to me, in the replies of the four men previously quoted from the questionnaire: "It made me less assertive, and more charitable toward the views of others." What a happy result of good teaching, or good sense, or both, when our students are uniformly tolerant of the views of others!

Classroom method, it seems to me will play an important part in improving the situation in this respect. When students learn to talk to the audience, not to the judges, when they develop a strong desire to argue for the end of conviction and persuasion and not for winning;[3] when questions are chosen which enable students to assimilate the results of their reading and research to a greater degree, and speak forth ideas that bears more the stamp of their own personalities, then the habits of thinking and mental attitude of our students will be tremendously improved.

The swing away from the position of "debating coach," both in name and practice, to "teacher of debating" or "director of debating" which the last few years have witnessed, we hail as a wholesome sign. Sometimes, however, university administrators have been more ready to make the transition than have the teachers themselves.

Informality in classroom practice furnishes, in itself, a topic of sufficient importance for a talk or series of talks. Have we fallen into some ruts? Do we follow practices simply because of precedent? Why must we have three speakers to a side—or two to a side? Why always the same number of speakers on each side? Why a set length of time for speeches? Why so often a judge's or judges' decision? Why designate speeches as "constructive" and "rebuttal?" Why only one rebuttal speech or one series of rebuttal

[3]I recognize the position taken by O'Neill, Laycock & Scales, in their text, "Argumentation and Debate," in saying that "the time allowed is too short to prove the cases . . . in intercollegiate debate" (p. 372), and by Winans in remarking that "it is folly, evidently enough, to try to change a fixed belief in a single speech; unless it has already been much weakened" (Public Speaking, p. 275), and heartily agree with them. I do not regard my statement as inconsistent with their position; my attack is on the atitude of mind of this type of debater toward his proposition and his audience.

speeches on each side? *Why all the formality?* These are not the conditions under which those students will usually argue and discuss in later life.

Again, we might at times have more *argumentative speaking* as distinct from formal debate. Let the student sometimes build up a case and then proceed, himself, to tear it down. Sometimes give the liberty to anyone in the class to reply when a student has finished, with further speaking by each one alternately until one of them is silenced; sometimes have the entire class at liberty to interrupt during the actual speaking, to question or refute. Sometimes let two people or two teams cross-question each other, and build their arguments on the results of this cross-questioning.

There is another phase that I think sorely needs attention in relation to the ends of argumentation. That is persuasion. Our students need to be more imbued with the vital relation of persuasion to successful argumentation, and they need to be better grounded and better trained in employing persuasive principles in their speaking.

One of the questions I asked of directors of debating on the Information Blank was, "How do you think more interest in courses in argumentation and debate can be aroused among college students?" The replies are so suggestive that I shall leave them for consideration at another time.

Now, what are to be included among the essential factors involved in a vitalization of the course of study in argumentation and debate? Are they not straight thinking, sound and effective speaking? Are they not a uniform thoroughness in teaching both the knowledge materials of the subject and skill in oral presentation of these materials? Should not the focus of such vitalization be development in intensity and extensity of the curricular work, and the eradication of practices and methods that inculcate in students faulty and unwholesome tendencies and points of view? And do not the lines converge in the sort of college and university training in argumentation and debate that helps to prepare each student for the most useful place in productive society which his capacity and lot in life may permit him to occupy?

SPEECH STANDARDS IN THE THEATRE

ELMER KENYON
Schenley High School, Pittsburgh, Pa.

THOUGH France is essentially given to respect for tradition and authoritative precept, a great French critic has said, "It is universal suffrage which rules a language, and no dictator has any authority." His generalization applies more nearly to the condition of oral speech in America than to the practice in France. The French school-boy who is taken to the Theatre Français hears not only the speech that the French nation accepts unquestioningly as standard, but the classics as they have been performed, with veneration for the minutest detail in their interpretation, ever since the days of Moliére. The boy grown a man may return to this national conservatory of speech and classical dramatic literature to see the actors of a later generation, but he will hear the intonation and pronunciation made familiar to him a score of years before, while at the same time being fortified in his cultural appreciation of the permanence of the pieces immortalized by that famous theatre of tradition.

The German school-boy, whose interest in the drama is fostered by the performance of standard plays from the repertories of the world in the municipal theatre flourishing in any town of fair size in his country, is taught to develop his diction in accord with the norm which he hears on the stage. To him the standard definitely set is the *Bühnenaussprache*, or authoritative German speech determined in 1898 by an official committee.

The American school-boy, on the contrary, meets in few textbooks any reference to the beauty and correctness of the speech used on the contemporary stage, he rather receives a vague caution about observing the speech of the majority of educated people. Though as early as 1780, John Adams proposed the establishment of a National Academy to determine an independent American language, and Noah Webster three years later supported the suggestion, we have evidently held with the French critic that "no dictator has any authority." A nationally supported theatre was

advocated as early as 1842 by Dunlop, a manager and historian of theatrical annals, but democracy in America has thrown the stage along with other precious matters to the tender mercies of the masses, whose industrial struggle creates respect primarily for the survival of palpable utilities making for physical comfort. Whereas the greater art of the Old World was produced under the paternalism of the state, or the patronage of those whom the state favored, in the New World, art having been cast upon the mart of trade along with tooth brushes and soap, an illusory dependence upon democracy, as a kind of magic, nurses a watery hope that a man of wealth here and there on this far-flung continent may provide for the nurture of beauty those temples that come not from our scheme of things. Then, all too often, the temple amply provided is maintained by our political representatives as grudgingly as though it were a super-imposed white elephant.

The theatre, being of all the arts the most vitally dependent upon popular suffrage and being intractable to endowment by the individual, has in our day become enslaved to the raw greed of business. Considered as a cultural force or as a social necessity for the enlargement of human sympathies and the evocation of deeply spiritual aspiration in the sense in which the Greek drama stirred the people of country and town, the American theatre, not of New York, but of the one hundred and twenty million is impotent, remote, and self-destructively mercenary. With the control of almost all first class theatres from the Atlantic seaboard to Kansas City directly or indirectly under the thumb of two booking syndicates, with the elimination of private initiative and the transformaton of the theatre into a purely commercial enterprise in which real estate speculators play a game for dividends, and with the encroachment of motion pictures as a less hazardous commodity for the investor, the spoken drama has declined so steadily that at the moment, the theatres of our larger cities either have surrendered to films *in toto* or house three or more girl-shows to one serious play.

To make the condition more alarming these plays of native origin have latterly exploited a realism in dialectal speech that has given wider and wider currency to regional departures from the standard of good use. Plays like *Sun Up* and *Hell-Bent for Heaven*

have familiarized us with likeable provincialisms of the Southern mountaineers; *The Show-off, Is Zat So? The Fall Guy, The Butter and Egg Man,* and *So This Is London* have glorified the snappy lingo of men-about-town; and much of the work of our greatest dramatist, Eugene O'Neill, is cast in dialects that issue from types as various as illiterate Swedish seamen and Harlem negroes. What havoc the vogue of such plays works with the diction of the actors who play in them is sadly apparent in the mixture of pronunciation and even enunciation observable in their speech when they happen to be cast in a play expressing itself in the King's English.

That it was not ever thus is revealed in the history of the American theatre during the nineteenth century. Even in pre-Revolutionary days when Hallam, "the Father of the American Stage," brought from England the standard of speech set by Garrick, the theatre introduced principles to which colloquial practice could be referred; and down to almost our own era the recognized dignity and authority of cultured English diction was conserved through regard for tradition by such actors as Junius Brutus Booth, Edwin Booth, Charlotte Cushman, Ada Rehan, Helen Modjeska, Edward H. Sothern, Julia Marlowe, Richard Mansfield, John McCullough, Lawrence Barrett, E. L. Davenport, Adelaide Neilson, Mary Anderson, Clara Morris, and, to include visitors, Henry Irving, Ellen Terry, E. S. Willard, and Sir Johnston Forbes-Robertson. Great and numerous as these names are, the men and women who bore them encompassed so limited and so recent a period that a living critic like J. Rankin Towse, who still writes for *The New York Evening Post,* very probably recalls having heard every one of them intone the grandeur of our English tongue at its noblest, for they one and all did enact the plays of Shakespeare.

For a measure with the present, it may be remarked that the American stage at the moment gives but faint support to only one Shakespearian actor—Walter Hampden; and there are few New York critics sympathetic enough with Shakespeare even to attempt to estimate Mr. Hampden's adequacy as an interpreter.

Thus the trend of the times!

The melancholy conclusion to which these considerations lead is that in speech and dramatic training the schools and colleges must largely carve out for themselves a way apart from the mere-

tricious and moribund theatre of the professional actor. Leaders of youth, as rarely ever before, may rightly regard the task of recovering the heritage of the fine art of drama and of restoring it to the people, as squarely dependent upon the zeal of education in the promotion of our richer spiritual existence and abetted by the consciousness of communities awakened to their powers in establishing their own centers for expression and joy in terms of drama. That a highly discriminating, hence sporadic, relationship between the school and the contemporary theatre may at times, with clear qualification, be encouraged is as much as regard for the integrity of education can admit. Here, the selective support rendered by the Drama League to the worthy play may well be a guide. Mainly, however, the school and the play-house cannot be now inter-related as they were in the day when, as Jusserand said, "Music and poetry traveled with the minstrels and gleemen along the English highways; it was expected from them that they would bring joy and forgetfulness."

THE TEACHING OF PUBLIC SPEAKING IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF ENGLAND

GLADYS M. BAKER
London Secondary Schools

Public speaking as a subject with its alloted hours on the school timetable is an unknown thing in England; nor are there to be found in our secondary schools teachers with specific academic qualifications in this subject. It is, of course, possible to obtain training in public speaking and elocution in these isles, but the sole demand for such instruction comes from the political enthusiastic and the would-be-accomplished lady or gentleman of the breed now practically extinct.

The lack of definite recognition of this subject does not, however, imply its total neglect; it merely means that it is considered to be a branch of English, and as such, its teaching is left, more or less entirely, to the teacher of English.

There have, for some time, been apparent indications of the growing recognition of the value of oral work; and though con-

siderably more attention is paid to instruction in literature and written composition, yet the younger or more go-ahead teachers are realizing that the ability to speak well is as important to the child as the art of writing well. The interesting experiment carried out by Cauldwell Cook and described in *The Play Way* has undoubtedly done much to convince English teachers of what can be done, and in the majority of schools some, at least, of his suggestions have been adopted.

It is in the conduct of the oral composition lesson that the new spirit makes itself most manifest; its form is much more varied than of yore and its control is frequently taken over by the class: stump speeches, lecturettes, and debates being the order of the day. Either at the close of the period or in a subsequent lesson the teacher once again assumes direction, and encourages criticism of the speeches which have been made. Not every school manages to set aside as much as one lesson a week regularly for this kind of training, but there are few schools now which do not devote at least one lesson a month to this work.

In addition to this, many schools boast a flourishing literary and debating society with weekly or fortnightly meetings during the winter months, and it is becoming more and more common to find this society run almost entirely by the scholars themselves, the staff realising that what is lost by the inferior quality of the lectures—given now by the children instead of by some better informed adult—is more than compensated for by the experience they gain. The rural schools naturally lag behind the town schools, for such societies are held out of school hours and the many children who have a four or five mile walk to school (English children do not possess their own cars, nor do the majority of their parents; at best they cycle) are anxious to get home by daylight if possible, and look askance at anything that will keep them in school after four o'clock.

More is being done, too, towards providing some dramatic training. In junior forms the expression part of a literature lesson instead of taking the form of question and answer not infrequently now takes the form of an impromptu dramatisation, which is sometimes even worked up till it is fit for a performance to the rest of the school.

There is also an increasing sense of the possibilities of the

Shakespeare lesson; and the old treatment of a Shakespeare play which ignored its dramatic qualities is now comparatively rare. Even the preliminary reading of the play is made a dramatic one, and the study is rarely considered complete until one or more scenes are committed to memory and acted.

Besides this, most schools have an annual function at which some dramatic performance figures on the programme. Too often isolated scenes are selected for acting, the production of a complete play being considered as too great a task on the time and resources of the school, though there are cases in which this is done deliberately in order that a great number of children may perform. When there is more than one function of this kind a year, the need for money for games-fund, library, or a charity, almost invariably furnishes the explanation, and the necessity to curtail expenses keeps the production from being of a very ambitious nature. It is only the wealthier schools of our cities that can ever afford to produce a play for the play's sake content with merely making it pay its way.

Debately, speech making, and dramatic work though figuring more largely than they used to do are not yet considered to be of vital importance. The Englishman talks at his best in tête à tetê and not in public. As a nation we have an innate suspicion of the man who is too ready with his tongue and it is for this reason that we are paying less attention in England than is being paid in the states to the teaching of public speaking.

AN INTRODUCTION TO CLASSICAL RHETORIC*

EVERETT LEE HUNT
Cornell University

This reading list does not pretend to be exhaustive. It is selected with the purpose of presenting the most important references which are readily accessible in English, or in English translation. As the substance of a college course, this material presents

*This is the second of a series of brief bibliographies for beginners, each covering one of the fields of study represented in the JOURNAL. The first, on Speech Correction, by Smiley Blanton, appeared in February 1924.

a body of literature which is worthy of study for its own sake; it supplements work which is very generally offered in ancient literature and philosophy, and it provides a background of ideas which greatly increases the significance of practical training in persuasive discourse.

THE SOPHISTS

Philostratus and Eunapius, *Lives of the Sophists*, tr. by W. C. Wright. New York, 1922.

George Grote, *History of Greece*, London, 1851, VIII, chap. 67.

J. S. Mill, "Grote's *Plato*," *Dissertations and Discussions*, New York, 1874, IV.

Henry Sidgwick, "The Sophists." *Lectures on the Philosophy of Kant and Other Philosophical Lectures and Essays*, London, 1905.

R. C. Jebb, Article on Rhetoric in the *Brittannica*.

H. Jackson, Article on Sophists in the *Brittannica*.

G. H. Lewes, *Biographical History of Philosophy*, London, 1857.

E. Zeller, *Pre-Socratic Philosophy*, tr. by S. F. Alleyne, London, 1881, II, Sect. iii.

A. Grant, *The Ethics of Aristotle*, London, 1874, I, pp. 103-154.

Th. Gomperz, *Greek Thinkers*, tr. by L. Magnus, New York, 1901, I, Chaps. 5, 6, 7.

Bromley Smith, "Corax and Probability," *Quarterly Journal of Speech Education*, VII, 13. "Protagoras of Abdera," *same*, IV, 196. "Prodicus of Ceos," *same*, VI, 51. "Gorgias; a Study of Oratorical Style," Style," *same*, VII, 535. "Hippias and a Lost Canon of Rhetoric," *same*, XII.

PLATO

B. Jowett, translations of and introductions to *The Dialogues of Plato. Gorgias, Phaedrus, Sophists, Euthydemus, Menexenus.* General familiarity with *Republic* assumed.

George Grote, *Plato*, London, 1888.

Th. Gomperz, *Greek Thinkers*, New York, 1901

E. M. Cope, *Gorgias*, London, 1868, Introduction.

W. H. Thompson, *Phaedrus*, London, 1868, Introduction.

ARISTOTLE

W. Rhys Roberts, *Aristotle's Rhetoric*, Oxford, 1924. This volume also contains translations of the *Poetics*, and the *Rhetoric to Alexander*. Roberts' translation is the clearest in technical terminology. Jebb's translation, Cambridge, 1909, has a valuable introduction, and useful notes. Welldon's translation, London, 1886, is now out of print. Its analyses are particularly helpful.

Lane Cooper, *Aristotle On the Art of Poetry: an Amplified Version with Supplementary Illustrations for Students of English*, Boston, 1913.

E. M. Cope, *An Introduction to Aristotle's Rhetoric*, London, 1867.

Th. Gomperz, *Greek Thinkers*, New York, 1912, IV.
E. Zeller, *Aristotle and the Earlier Peripatetics*, London, 1897.
George Grote, *Aristotle*, London, 1872.

ISOCRATES

R. C. Jebb, *Attic Orators*, London, 1893, II.
J. F. Dobson, *The Greek Orators*, New York, 1923.
H. M. Hubbell, *The Influence of Isocrates on Cicero, Dionysius, and Aristides*, New Haven, 1913.
J. P. Mahaffy, *Old Greek Education*, New York, 1905.
Russell H. Wagner, "The Rhetorical Theory of Isocrates," *Quarterly Journal of Speech Education*, VIII, 323.
La Rue Van Hook, "Alcidamas vs. Isocrates: the Spoken vs. the Written Word." *Classical Weekly*, XII, 89-94.

DEMETRIUS.

W. Rhys Roberts, *Demetrius On Style*, Cambridge, 1902.

CICERO.

J. S. Watson, *Cicero on Oratory and Orators*, London, 1881, contains translations of the *De Oratore* and the *Brutus*.
C. D. Yonge, *Orations of Cicero*, IV, London, 1890, contains translations of the *Orator* and the *De Inventione*.
J. E. Sandys, *M. Tulli Ciceronis ad M. Brutum Orator*, Cambridge, 1885, Introductory essays.
A. S. Wilkins, *M. Tulli Ciceronis de oratore libri tres*, Oxford, 1892, Introduction.
T. Petersson, *Cicero: A Biography*, University of California, 1920, Chap. XII.

DIONYSIUS.

W. Rhys Roberts, *Dionysius of Halicarnassus: the Three Literary Letters*, Cambridge, 1901.
W. Rhys Roberts, *Dionysius of Halicarnassus on Literary Composition*, London, 1910.

LONGINUS

W. Rhys Roberts, *Longinus On the Sublime*, Cambridge, 1899.

TACITUS

W. Peterson, *Dialogue On Oratory*, New York, 1914.
W. Peterson, *Cornelii Taciti Dialogues De Oratoribus*, Oxford, 1893, Introduction.
Oxford translation, *The Works of Tacitus*, London, 1854, II.
G. Boissier, "*Tacitus and Other Roman Studies*, New York, 1906, "The Schools of Declamation at Rome."

QUINTILIAN

J. S. Watson, *Quintilian's Institutes of Oratory*, London, 1882.
H. E. Butler, *Quintilian's Institutes of Oratory*, New York, 1923.

W. Peterson, *Quintilian, Book X*, Oxford, 1893, Introduction.
F. H. Colson, *Quintilian, Book I*, Cambridge, 1924, Introduction.

ST. AUGUSTINE

J. F. Shaw, *St. Augustine's "On Christian Doctrine,"* Book IV, in *Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers*, Buffalo, 1887, Vol. II. Also in *Works of St. Augustine*, edited by Marcus Dods, Edinburgh, 1873, Vol. X.
Charles Sears Baldwin, "St. Augustine and the Rhetoric of Cicero," *Proceedings of the Classical Association*, April, 1925.. Roy J. Deferrari, "St. Augustine's Method of Composing and Delivering Sermons," *American Journal of Philology* XLIII, Nos. 170 and 171.
Edwin Hatch, *The Influence of Greek Customs and Usages on the Christian Church*, London, 1890, Chap. 4.
James B. Eskridge, *The Influence of Cicero upon Augustine in the Development of his Oratorical Theory for the Training of the Ecclesiastical Orator.* Menasha, Wis., 1912.
Sister M. Inviolata Barry, *St. Augustine, the Orator*, The Catholic University of America, 1924.

GENERAL WORKS

Charles Sears Baldwin, *Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic*, New York, 1924.
Charles Sears Baldwin, Article on Rhetoric in the *Encyclopaedia of Education*, edited by Paul Monroe.
Fred N. Scott, Article on Rhetoric in the *International Encyclopaedia.*
D. L. Clark, *Rhetoric and Poetry in the Renaissance*, New York, 1922.
George Saintsbury, *A History of Criticism*, New York, 1902, I.
Morris Croll, "'Attic Prose' in the Seventeenth Century," *Studies in Philology*, April, 1921.
G. L. Hendrickson, "Origin and Meaning of the Characters of Style," *American Journal of Philology*, 26:249.
Paul Shorey, "What Teachers of Speech May Learn from the Theory and Practice of the Greeks," *Quarterly Journal of Speech Education*, VIII, 105 .

EDITORIAL

A NEW SORT OF DIRECTORY

FOR some years it has been our custom to include in the November QUARTERLY JOURNAL a directory of our membership, arranged by states and cities, including only the names and addresses of our paid-up subscribers. The directory has served many useful purposes, and we have no thought of a permanent change of policy.

It often happens, however, that the name one wants to look up is missing from the directory because the owner—not infrequently an old and settled member of the ASSOCIATION—has forgotten to pay up in time. Likewise it often happens that one would like to know the age, rank, and degrees of some teacher of speech, perhaps with a view to offering him a position. With this in mind, a number of our subscribers have asked us to get out a different sort of directory, and this we shall do in 1926, omitting, temporarily, the ordinary directory.

The new directory will include the name, degrees, academic title and affiliation of every teacher of speech known to us, regardless of whether he is or is not a paid-up subscriber. But we are not omniscient, and the burden of responsibility must rest upon the individual to furnish us with the necessary information. A blank for this purpose will be found on page 242 of this issue, and a similar blank will be mailed to anyone upon request. We do not guarantee the inclusion of any name unless we receive from its owner a blank properly and legibly filled out.

The new directory will NOT be printed in the regular pages of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL, but will be printed separately and distributed at a price of twenty-five cents a copy, *payable at the time the registration blank is sent in.* Assuming that most of those whose names are included will want copies, this is barely sufficient

to pay the cost of printing and mailing; if the response is not generous we shall lose money. But we should not undertake the extra labor involved if we did not believe that virtually every teacher of speech will want a copy and will consider it worth twenty-five cents.

Please consult the directions on page 242. Then fill out and mail the blank at once. Do not wait until you have time to forget it, or until you go off on your vacation travels. The directory may be published before you think of it again—with your name left out.

THE NOVEMBER QUARTERLY

IN spite of the fact that this is almost as much of a "research" number as the June number of last year we feel justified in promising for November an over-size issue containing a volume of research material surpassing anything we have yet attempted. The special committee appointed at the 1925 convention, under the able chairmanship of Mr. Wichelns, has some material already on hand, expects more, and solicits still more. Our plan is to publish all we have money to pay for, provided the quality is sufficiently high. On the latter point we are not troubled; rather we expect such keen competition for space as to make it a difficult matter to select the best of many good things. For this special issue only complete studies are wanted, whether long or short. Summaries may be submitted to the Editor for other purposes, but will not be considered by the committee. All manuscripts for the special section mut be in the hands of the committee by July 31. Get your contribution in early; the more time we have for careful editing in coöperation with the author, the better the chance of publication. Manuscripts mey be sent either to the Editor or to Mr. Wichelns. Provision is being made for separate reprints of the special studies at a nominal price, and for supplying extra copies of the whole issue to the contributors of articles and the contributors of funds.

THE FORUM

[EDITOR'S NOTE: Letters for the FORUM should be direct and concise. They may be upon any topic in Speech Education, controversial or otherwise; but publication is not to be regarded as editorial endorsement, either as to form or as to content.]

OUT GO THE CANDLES

To the Editor of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION:

Dear Sir—While I was reading Mr. Lionel Crocker's interesting article on "The Voice Element in Prose" in the April QUARTERLY JOURNAL, my thoughts were brought up short and unpleasantly by an error which, though slight in itself, should hardly be allowed to stand. In speaking of the audience to which Emerson addressed "The American Scholar," Mr. Crocker pictures it as "seated on hard, uncomfortable straight-back chairs blinded by a noisy blaze of unsympathetic candelabra." Evidently the writer had in mind a typical lyceum audience of Emerson's time, to which his description might apply, though I believe benches or pews were more used by such than chairs. But he is speaking definitely of "The American Scholar," which was delivered on August 31, 1837, at an anniversary service of the Harvard Phi Beta Kappa in the Cambridge meeting-house. The service began at high noon; hence the "noisy blaze of unsympathetic candelbra" is a gratuitous invention.

Mr. Crocker evidently accepts the principle that the audience and occasion have much to do with a speaker's style. Hence, in discussing the "voice element" in "The American Scholar" he surely would have done well to reconstruct as accurately as possible the speaking situation. As a matter of fact, this task was done for him, most competently and fully, by Bliss Perry in "Emerson's Most Famous Speech," an essay in that author's *The Praise of Folly* (1923). James Russell Lowell's memories of the occasion are

given briefly in his essay, "Thoreau," in *My Study Windows.*

Quite apart from Mr. Crocker's paper, is it not true that, as a class, we who have to do with public speaking are lamentably ignorant of our own classics?

Very truly yours,
HOYT H. HUDSON,
University of Pittsburgh.

EDUCATIONAL DRAMATICS

To the Editor of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION:

Dear Sir—In three places in the February JOURNAL a cleavage appears between the few that know and the many that would like to know; between what interests the learned lights, and the much humbler interests of the common teacher. This is apparent in the editorial entitled "The Appeal of the Quarterly Journal" and in the remarkably clear-cut article by Mr. Reeid. The same division was noticeable at the Pittsburgh Conference on the Drama in American Universities and Little Theatres.

It seemed to me that most of the speakers at the Pittsburgh Conference were speaking along pre-conceived lines; that they had not adjusted their minds to the new situation nor recognized that they had a decidedly different audience from the people they usually address.

The delegates came from twenty-seven states. Twenty-nine of them were from Little (or Big) Theatres. The remaining one hundred and twenty came from eighty different colleges or universities. Of these eighty institutions, perhaps half a dozen give courses in the dramatic arts complete enough for professional preparation. Almost all the hundred and twenty delegates represented institutions that do not give adequate preparation for the commercial theatre, nor for the professional director of a community theatre.

Back of all the discussion was this question—never directly stated in any of the addresses: Are these seventy-five colleges impertinently dabbling in dramatics, or have they a moral right to offer courses that make no pretense to adequate bread-and-butter training?

The non-college delegates apparently came there wondering, as one principal of a dramatic school phrased it, "what the colleges

could contribute to the theatre.'' The was no indication that any surmise had arisen in their minds as to what the theatres, or their representatives, could do for the colleges. Yet surely in a joint conference, it was not unreasonable to expect some address from that point of view. Does the theatre exist for itself, or to contribute to the general welfare?

A just judgment upon college dramatics cannot be reached until the persons that know most about dramatics cease to say ''What can these groups contribute to us?'' and ask instead ''What can they contribute to the general welfare, to the enjoyment of the common people?'' and ''What can we, with our expert knowledge, contribute to help them do that task better than they are now doing it?''

The most significant thing about the attendance at the Pittsburgh Conference was the remarkable eagerness of those teaching dramatics in the colleges to pick up some of the crumbs from the richly laden table of the theatrical experts. Most of them were keenly conscious of the inartistic results their students achieve. They came with almost pathetic eagerness from twenty-seven states, hoping to get suggestions that would help them to do their own task better. And they discovered that the experts had never imagined that such a task exists. It had apparently never occurred to these masters of their own profession that anyone could dream of any aim in college or community dramatics that did not carry them into the atmosphere, if not into the area, of the professional theatre.

Has dramatics any legitimate place in Education? Many of us have been struggling for years to convince the educational administrators that it has. Now instead of sympathetic wisdom from the worshipful Experts, comes the stern judgment that we do not really ''belong.'' Outcasts at the palace gate!

Are these people so out-of-touch with educational policies and procedure that they think colleges should be mere training-places to increase one's earning power? We should perhaps hasten to admit that schools everywhere, even outside those advertised in popular magazines, have been considerably vocationalized. But are we ready to assume that if a college offers a course in Dramatics, it ought to give sufficient preparation to qualify students for the professional stage?

This assumption seems to underlie Mr. Reeid's article also. Its concluding clause "in order that the theatre may live" seems to be the animating thought throughout. There are definite strictures against the teacher who defends himself as not aiming to prepare students for professional work in dramatics.

I took a brief general course in Botany while in college, and did fairly decent work in it. But it gave me no professional preparation. I do not know enough to teach Botany, to gather medicinal herbs, nor even to write delightful books on our native wildflowers. I did learn enough however to furnish me constant delight in the fields and woods, and I venture to think the process was educational.

Shall no one dare to elect a course in Astronomy unless he promises to spend his life in an observatory? Is nobody to be allowed to study Trigonometry except prospective engineers? Must we eliminate Greek from the schedules of all students that do not expect to teach Greek, or go into the Mediterranean Consular service? The question practically becomes this: Should a college give a course in any subject, if its trustees do not consider it wise to offer full professional training in that subject?

Is not the difference between training and education fundamentally this: that training works towards a pre-determined career, while education seeks to develop the latent abilities of the individual, whatever they may be, without putting a mortgage on his future activity?

If none of these hundred-and-twenty college teachers should ever send any student to the professional stage, their dramatic work might still be a great success.

Even if they should never send any student into active coöperation in a community theatre, their work would not necessarily be a failure.

Very truly yours,
JAMES WATT RAINE,
Berea College.

ASSOCIATION NEWS

THE 1926 CONVENTION

WORD comes from President Mabie that the PALMER HOUSE in Chicago, will be headquarters for the 1926 Convention of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH. The hotel is new, and has excellent accommodations for a convention of this sort. Room rates are reasonable, but reservations should be made early. The dates are December 28, 29, and 30.

All questions regarding the Convention, and all suggestions as to the building of the program, should be mailed to the President, E. C. Mabie, University of Iowa, Iowa City.

NEW BOOKS

[As far as possible staff reviewers are assigned to cover the new books, but voluntary contributions are always welcome, especially if concise and informative. Reviews, or suggests of books to be reviewed should be sent to Hoyt H. Hudson, University of Pittsburgh.]

The Control of the Breath, by GEORGE DODDS AND JAMES DUNLOP LICKLEY. London. Oxford University Press. 1925. 65 Pp.

According to the Preface, "this little volume is an endeavor to present a description of the mechanism of respiration, and an explanation of its action in such a manner that the student of singing, elocution, or physical culture may have a basis upon which existing systems or authorities can be examined and judged." Just why this book is a better basis for such a judgment than any other is not however made clear.

The point of view is that of music and singing rather than speech, and yet the teacher of speech will find in it much of value. The first part of the book, devoted to the anatomy of the vocal apparatus, is particularly clear, and profusely illustrated. Seven types of breathing are considered: Abdominal, inferior costal, type A, inferior costal, type B, lateral costal, type A, lateral costal, type B, thoracic and a combination of abdominal and thoracic. The latter is advocated, and its advantages explained at some length. The explanation is convincing, but hardly new.

The exercises prescribed are numerous, the points of emphasis being the *messa di voce*, and the familiar dicta of the Italian masters—relaxing the throat, forwarding the tone, and singing on the breath.

On the whole the book is sound, though brief. It would be too technical to put into the hands of any but the most advanced students of public speaking, but for the teacher it might prove as

useful as some of the larger works, especially on the side of vocal anatomy.

JOHN DOLMAN, JR., *University of Pennsylvania.*

Better Speech, by ANNIE E. POLK. Century Co. 1924 pp. XXVI, 251. (Preface by H. B. Moore).

The *raison d'etre* of this book is surely reasonable enough. As H. B. Moore (Principal of the Girls' High School of Louisville, in which Miss Polk teaches English) says, in the reaction from the study of formal grammar and the modern cultivation of composition, oral and written, high school students today are able to talk glibly, but alas "loosely and inaccurately." The remedy, according to Principal Moore, seems to be a text book, skillfully taught, which shall contain the irreducible minimum of grammar absolutely necessary to complete comprehension and accurate speaking and writing of our language, with an approach through the brief, enticing lanes of phonetics and the use of the dictionary.

This, then, is not a book on public speaking but, in its best sense, a book on speech. Miss Polk herself says " . . . this book is intended primarily to teach the pupil to form correct speech habits . . . "

As may be expected, almost four-fifths of the book is given over to grammar. There is nothing very new about this section. It is formal grammar, with a minimum of theory and a maximum of practice. There is obviously no attempt to interest or to relate to the students' experience through project methods or the like. It is apparently comprehensive and accurate. Exercises in every phase of formal grammatical drill are provided.

Two chapters precede the work on grammar. The first, "Phonetics and Oral English," with its sub-headings of "Our Speech Habits," "The Voice," "Breathing, "Nasality" and the like, arouses high hopes. Of the twenty-two pages in this chapter, however, ten are given up to "Some bad speech habits," which turn out to be such habits as using *reckon* for *think, turn down* for *decline,* and *smart* for *clever.* About twelve pages are thus left to phonetics proper.

The analysis of the problems of Oral English begins with the importance of breathing. A simple exercise, sensible enough, is

prescribed. Then follows a brief discussion of mumbling and other causes of incorrect enunciation. No explanation of how the student is to acquire good habits of enunciation is given other than such dicta as "To speak distinctly the teeth must be separated at least half an inch"—at which some phoneticians may reasonably be expected to gasp. Some practice sentences like "Cease to sing sad songs of sorrow" are offered to fix particular sounds.

The value of the advice on "r" is certainly questionable:

> "R betrays locality. In some parts of the Middle West it is unduly prolonged, giving a harsh sound. In some parts of the South it is suppressed almost entirely. Neither pronunciation should be encouraged. There should be a happy medium that will bring out the music of the word.
>
> "Pronounce carefully the following: . . . . . ."

Surely, no one will now be in doubt as to just how he may learn to pronounce this troublesome consonant!

The section on pronunciation is somewhat more satisfactory, although there is more of enunciation than pronunciation in it. In the section called "Mispronunciation," thirty-one words are given correctly and incorrectly. (One wonders why *these* thirty-one were chosen. Surely they are not *all* the words mispronounced by high school students? Or do they represent types of mispronunciation?) Objection may be made to this example: "bäth, *not* bath."

The principal criticism of the book is that, like most other books of its kind, it fails to take account of the psychological factors in speech, especially of interest and attention. While it is not guilty of the fatuous empiricism of "Talking Well" by Fulton and Harrington, it makes no advance over a multitude of other grammars or exercise books. A good teacher, who understood the psychology of high school students, the phenomenon of speech, and who could arouse interest in speaking and writing good English, would be able to use the book; but—such a teacher would not need it.

R. H. WAGNER, *Iowa State College.*

A Manual of English. By GEORGE B. WOODS and CLARENCE STRATTON. Doubleday, Page & Co., 1926. Pp. xxv & 282.

"This book is concerned primarily with the *means* of communicating ideas or information. It is to be taken for granted that

the body is more than raiment, that the content of a composition—whether written or spoken—is more important than its language or its style. The book does not aim to supply training in thinking, or to present material for discussion. Nor is it meant to be a complete treatise on the art of writing and speaking. It does aim, however, to stress those principles which are necessary to the clear and effective presentation of ideas and to make practical the clear and correct use of ordinary English."

The result of the author's labors toward reaching this aim, so carefully defined in their Preface, is an accurate and well-catalogued handbook of numbered rules (both positive and negative ones), belonging to the group of texts in which Woolley's *Handbook of Composition* (1907) was the pioneer. The use of such books seems to be in line with the present "minimum essentials" standardization of high school and college English. A careful set of minimum essentials in each year's work for three years of high school is offered in the Introduction of the present book. Because of its happily-chosen illustrative material and its compact and practical structure, *A Manual of English* will easily stand comparison with any of its numerous fellows in the group to which it belongs. The list of words frequently mispronounced (very full, but set down without indication of correct pronunciation) may interest teachers of speech-craft.

HOYT H. HUDSON, *University of Pittsburgh.*

The Phantom Public. By WALTER LIPPMANN. New York. Harcourt, Brace and Company. 1925.

Mr. Lippman here attempts to define the limitations of public opinion as a governing force in a democracy. "We must abandon the notion that the people govern. Instead we must adopt the theory that, by their occasional mobilizations as a majority, people support or oppose the individuals who actually govern. We must say that the popular will does not direct continuously but that it intervenes occasionally." When the public does intervene, it does not do so upon the merits of the question, about which it can know little; it merely supports one of the parties to the controversy. The interest of the public is not in any rules and contracts and customs themselves, but in the maintenance of a regime of rule, contract,

and custom. In any public question, then, there are only two things for the public to decide: Is the rule which should be applicable to the case defective? If it is, how shall the agency be recognized which is most likely to mend it? The public must learn to answer these questions quickly, and without any real understanding of the problem. It must act intelligently, but in ignorance. Open debate before such a public may lead to no conclusion and throw no light on the problem or its answer, but if it succeeds in identifying and discounting the self-interested group, and thus prevents the public from backing partisans and advocates, it fulfills its main purpose.

Mr. Lippmann believes that democracy has suffered from an unattainable ideal concerning the function of public opinion. "Democracy, therefore, has never developed an education for the public. It has merely given it a smattering of the kind of knowledge which the responsible man requires. It has, in fact, aimed not at making good citizens, but at making a mass of amateur executives. It has not taught the child how to act as a member of the public. It has merely given him a hasty, incomplete taste of what he might have to know if he meddled in everything."

The technique by which the public is to act intelligently though in ignorance is, Mr. Lippman admits, a difficult thing to create. While the volume is a real contribution to the evolution of such a technique, the principal achievement is the clear statement of the problem.

Government by talk has excited much contempt in a time when public opinion is declared to be the ruler of the world. This largely arises from a confusion of matters which should be administered by experts with policies which can only be determined by the public. Indiscriminate public discussion will only produce a nation of meddlesome amateurs. Training for public discussion will fail of its function if the problems set by Mr. Lippmann are not clearly recognized. But training which is directed to the discussion of really fundamental questions of public policy will aid in forming a conception of the very real, if limited, function of public discussion in modern government.

E. L. HUNT, *Cornell University.*

Best Sermons—1925. By JOSEPH FORT NEWTON. New York, Harcourt Brace and Co., 1925, pp. 337.

Dr. Newton's second anthology covers a somewhat broader field than did the first, including sermons by a Catholic, a Jew, and a layman, in addition to those by a number of Protestant clergymen. Although a selection of this kind necessarily mirrors, to some extent, the preferences of the selector, students of public speaking will nevertheless find in it copious material for a study of a form of oratory which is neglected out of all proportion to its public influence.

C. K. THOMAS, *Cornell University.*

Speech Correction. By R. C. BORDEN and A. C. BUSSE. New York. F. S. Crofts and Co 1925. 295 Pp.

[EDITOR'S NOTE: This book was reviewed in April by Robert West. Another review, by Miss Stinchfield, reached us later, and we publish here the portions of it not already covered by Mr. West.]

The authors of this book, as co-directors in the New York University Speech Clinic, have provided a practical, usable and thoroughly scientific text book for the speech practitioner, dentist or physician who deals with speech disorders. It has also the commendable feature of being useful to the patient, without instilling an inferiority complex or inducing a neurosis by a depressing discussion of symptoms. It includes helpful exercises and suggestions for the various types of cases discussed.

The first forty pages deal with a study of the speech mechanisms and the functions of respiration, phonation, resonation and articulation. The authors apparently had in mind in their preparation of the text, the teacher who should have some knowledge of the anatomy and physiology of the speech organs. The third qualification necessary is a knowledge of phonetics. Any teacher who is a speech specialist, should naturally be familiar with these essentials. For these, the book is most useful.

* * *

The chapters on Defects of Foreign Dialect are very good. The analysis of common errors and substitutions or confusions of sounds common among people just beginning to speak English, is pains-

takingly presented. There are many good examples of the types of error which one might expect to find classified under various language heads as for example the Roumanian who says: "Zere iss no lent like ziss America" for "There is no land like this America." The Rules of English Spelling included in this section might be helpful also to the left-handed-changed individual who often seems to appear as a stutterer in the speech clinic. In such cases mirror-writing tendencies persist oftentimes and disturbances affecting the motor speech and writing centers seem to occasion difficulty in spelling.

The treatment of provincial dialect is entertaining and helpful. It at once appears that such "dialects" are rather extensively found, but that after all, the nearest approach to standards of speech is to be sought in the cultural centers, whether London, New York, Chicago, San Francisco or New Orleans. The speech of the stage reflects, at least in the genuine New York companies, cosmopolitan standards with considerable fidelity, so that we know it is being done, and we hope these cultural centers may exert further influence in this direction.

A discussion of infantile perseverations is a whole story in itself, and in the brief chapter on this subject one finds that the authors open up a field which could well develop several text books upon the development of speech habits from childhood. Aside from Blanton's "Speech Training for Children," and a treatment of the subject in Baldwin and Stecher's "Psychology of the Pre-School Child," we find little in current literature on this subject. The book gives us hints and aids for training the child before the habits have become deeply rooted.

The chapter dealing with organic conditions affecting the speech function is recommended for the specialist who has had some training in the anatomy and physiology of the speech mechanism. "A little knowledge is a dangerous thing," and the authors clearly show that the speech specialist needs to be insistent upon medical coöperation and examination of all cases before treatment can be fairly undertaken.

SARA M. STINCHFIELD, *Mt. Holyoke College.*

Speech Training for Scottish Students. By WILLIAM GRANT and ELIZABETH H. A. ROBSON. Cambridge University Press. 1925. Pp. xiv—128.

[EDITOR'S NOTE: Two reviews of this book came in by the same mail, the one by Miss Barrows having been solicited. Since they are not quite parallel it has seemed best to print both, omitting certain passages that are duplications.]

I

First published as *The Pronunciation of English in Scotland* in 1913, this little book now appears with a new title, two authors in place of one (Mr. Grant alone having been responsible for the earlier edition), and a table of contents so changed as hardly to be recognizable. The marked alteration in the content seems to have been due to a change in purpose, as indeed the title suggests.

While there is assuredly no desire on the part of American teachers to force down the throats of their pupils a Scottish pronunciation, as there sometimes unfortunately is a desire to import the pronunciation of the South of England, this work may be worth our attention on two counts, and perhaps a third. First, it shows a divergence, and a wide one, from the too much insisted upon English of the South of England. Second, the specific changes in pronunciation made in the revised edition help us to realize the essentially fluid state of our language. And last, the pedagogical practices exemplified may not be uninteresting.

Said the preface to the edition of 1913: "A special book for Scottish students is rendered necessary because the phonetic basis of educated Scottish speakers differs in many respects from that of Southern English, and further because our teachers have peculiar difficulties to overcome in dealing with pupils whose everyday speech is Scottish dialect or Gaelic." And this edition: "There has been during these twelve years a quite decided movement towards the acceptance in Scotland of a modified English pronunciation as a standard." The language being considered is English, not the Scotch with which Burn's poems have made us familiar; it is no more a dialect than is the English of Oxford and Cambridge, or that of educated speakers in any region of the United States or Canada—and is just as much one. It is in many respects nearer to American than to Southern English, differing from the latter (according to the edition of 1913) in seventeen specific points. If

the standard pronunciation of London and the university centers finds itself so sternly repelled from the near districts of Scotland and the North of England, how much more should we, on the opposite shore of a not inconsiderable ocean, be justified in frowning upon any attempt to impose its standards upon our speech.

Speech Training for Scottish Students may well have a special interest in this country at this time in view of the course in Phonetics to be given by Mr. Crant at Smith College in June.

LEE S. HULTZEN, *Ithaca, N. Y.*

II

The purpose of the book, as given by the authors, is to furnish a manual of speech training to students in Scottish Training Colleges as well as to teachers in Scottish schools. The standard of pronunciation recommended has for its basis "Standard Scots," somewhat modified by Southern English influence. The authors feel that the war and the radio are two strong factors in the willingness of Scottish speakers to accept, at least partially, the pronunciation of Southern English.

* * *

The chapters on organs of speech, intonation, stress, offer little new to the reader familiar with phonetic texts, and are applicable to any language. Discussion of the differences in the "phonetic basis" of Scots and Southern English would have been helpful. In the chapter on vowel quantity we find definite statements of differences between Southern English and Scottish English habits of varying vowel length. We find that *a* (ah) is not so long in Scots as in English; that *o* is generally very long except before a "breathed consonant or a liquid followed by a breathed consonant," when it is shortened. Before stops the vowels, especially high vowels, are shortened in Scots.

The sounds of English are taken up in detail. In each case the sound is described, different spellings of it are given, difficulties which speakers of different Scottish dialects have in forming the sound are discussed, and exercises for practice are given. Sometimes these exercises consist of pairs of contrasting words; sometime there are verses or quotations containing the sound in question.

We learn that final *d* has the tendency to become unvoiced;

that the glottal stop is heard frequently, sometimes even as a substitute for other sounds, as for the *tt* in butter. There is a tendency to omit medial *b, d, g* in the combinations *mb, nd, ng*. Four types of *r* occur: the lingual trill, the breather point trill which is heard occasionally in words beginning with *thr*, the voiced point fricative, and the inverted. It is considered good usage to use the fricative before vowels, the inverted before consonants and final. Contrary to Southern English usage, final *r* has been preserved in Scots; it is generally preceded by the indeterminate vowel. There are two sounds peculiar to Scots: the consonants final in *och* and *laogh*, (breathed and voiced velar fricatives, respectively). Speakers of certain dialects are warned not to unvoice *v, z* and *j* as in *judge;* others not to substitute *t* and *d* for voiced or unvoiced *th*, nor *sh* for *tsh*. The Scots still use *hw* when the spelling shows *wh*.

The book should be extremely helpful to those students for whom it was designed. It should also be of use to others whom the authors may not have had in mind, namely speakers of other dialects who wish to learn to pronounce Scots. By noting that the Scot should *not* do if he would speak standard English, we may discover what we *should* do if we would speak Scottish. . . Also it is the opinion of many students of American speech that standard Scots is a more suitable standard of speech for America than southern English.

SARAH T. BARROWS, *University of Iowa.*

Verbatim Record of the Sixth Assembly of the League of Nations; Reports of the Plenary Meetings. Boston. World Peace Foundation.

At first glance it may seem to members of the public speaking profession that a note designed for a political science review has slipped into the pages of the JOURNAL. Indeed, it was on the political scientist's quest that the reviewer first delved into the work here noted—but the return to it was as a student of the art and science of the spoken word, irresistibly drawn by a wealth of laboratory material discovered.

It was initially contended by opponents of the League of Nations that it would become "nothing but a gigantic debating society." Whether or not the "nothing but" has proved true is

beside the point here; certain it is that the meetings of the Assembly have become a world forum where representatives from practically all nations meet and speak. It is a dramatic situation, this one in which the diversity of the world is for a moment concentrated in union, a situation demanding the utmost of persuasive skill, the coolest of logical keenness, plus brilliant oratory. Where else could one find such material for a critical study of types of appeal and conviction, of the argumentative speech in vivid action today?

Outstanding at the Sixth Assembly was the initial speech by M. Painleve of France, (Report of the First Session) vitally interesting as an instance of an opening speech which must persuasively bind together yet make its own critically opposed point; outstanding, too, the brilliant work of M. Paul Boncour (Report of the Seventh Session) and, over against it, the speech of Mr. Chamberlain of Great Britain (Report of the Fifth Session). Between the latter two in speech method there is contrast brought to focus. It was Mr. Chamberlain who spoke with a calm keenness, a dispassionate logic, who won by the cool clarity of thought structure while from France came oratory warm with emotion. Differing from the work of any of these three yet eminently worthy of consideration is the speech of Dr. Benes of Czechoslovakia, (Report of the Ninth Session) father of the ill-fated protocol under Assembly discussion. Any speeches by Dr. Benes furnish valuable specimens for the study of argumentative structure. Here his work is largely defense, mainly refutation and vital as such, but in his constructive presentations he seems to have fallen heir to the Wilsonian, the systematic methodology; all the power of the developmental approach he brings to bear.

Such are a few of the speeches scattered in with procedure, reports of committees, etc. It is possible that they furnish more vital material for the student of today than that found in collections of speeches by orators of the past who used methods adapted to a different, a less snap-trigger age. For the reviewer they seem dynamically suggestive of research problems. One wonders—what is the correlation between nationality, country and type of speech development, or is it largely an individual thing? For the use of the student of the psychology of argument, for the study of the rhetorical forms that are effective, certainly for the logic of argument laboratory there is a wealth of material here.

The Record may be procured through the World Peace Foundation, Boston, Mass., but in most colleges and universities the political science or history department may be depended upon to have secured it. The subject matter, save as it may be involved in some specific debate, belongs to their field; the speech form and methods definitely and vitally to ours.

GLADYS MURPHY GRAHAM, *Los Angeles.*

IN THE PERIODICALS

[Material for this department should be sent to Mr. E. L. Hunt, Swarthmore College. Short reviews of important articles, notices of new publications of interest to our group, lists of articles or single items of possible interest, will be welcomed.]

NEW PUBLICATIONS

Among new publications received are the *Texas Speech Arts Magazine,* now in its second volume; the *Service Bulletin,* issued by the Williams School of Expression and Dramatic Art, Ithaca, New York, number three of which is devoted to speech improvement; and *Word Study,* published by G. and C. Merriam Company, Springfield, Mass. *Word Study* and the *Service Bulletin* will be sent without expense to any teachers requesting them.

ARTICLES REVIEWED

PARRISH, W. M. *A Series of Six Radio Talks on Public Speaking,* Radio Publication No. 20, University of Pittsburgh, 1926.

Professor Parrish has admirably condensed much material of the textbooks on public speaking, and has presented it clearly and interestingly. He warns against the misconception that public speaking is a knack that may be easily acquired by listening to radio talks, and urges his hearers to honest work as a preparation for speaking. The lectures were given on six Tuesday evenings from Station KDKA, and would seem to be well adapted to the conditions of the radio; the pamphlet will serve as an excellent basis for future experiment in instruction of this type.

E. L. H.

CLAPP, JOHN M. *Report of Committee on Place and Function of English in American Life.* English Journal, XV, 2, p. 110, February, 1926.

The National Council of Teachers of English believes that the purpose of teaching English is to develop in the student a command of language. The purpose of its Committee on Place and Function of English in American Life was to find out what demands actually are made upon the adult American today with respect to his use of, and difficulties with, language. Questionnaires were circulated in which the uses of language were grouped under the following heads: Interviewing, Conversation, Public Speaking, Writing, Reading, Listening. The dominance of speech in the use of language was clearly shown, interviews and conversation being the chief activities. Those replying to the questionnaire did not seem to regard high school and college training as particularly helpful in their difficulties with language. The general remarks of the committee on their data were (1) that the teaching of English does not have to do merely or mainly with form, but also with adjustment to social situations in which language is used, (2) that there is need of investigation of the instrument of language itself and the laws of its use, on the side of adjustment to social situations and conditions, and (3) that connections should be established between teachers of English and the movement for adult education. The committee specifically recommends (1) that schools devote more attention to those language activities which are most widely used, (2) that the findings of the present inquiry be supplemented by further studies, and (3) that the Council set up a permanent investigating body to study aims, curricula, methods, and classroom conditions, as remards their adequacy for enabling the men and women of the future to meet better the language demands made upon them.

Professor Fred Newton Scott, of the University of Michigan, in commending the report, declared that enough had been accomplished to show that the center of gravity in the teaching of the vernacular must be shifted. Defining rhetoric as the science that has to do with communication, with the distribution of ideas, just as economics has to do with the distribution of material things, he said that this investigation was concerned with rhetoric. The report, he believed, "tries to seize the fresh, palpitating life of

speech, the terse, idiomatic, concrete forms that spring into existence under the pressure of business and social impulsions, and from these to form, as it were, a picture of what I am accustomed to call the speech community—the whole complex or interworking of society so far as it is held together by the use of speech."

Orton Lowe, specialist in English for the state of Pennsylvania, urged that a special effort should be made to have information concerning the language activities of the lower social strata. The editor of the English Journal comments that this would increase the dominance of speech.

The English Journal prints only a condensed account of the work of the committee. The complete report will soon be published and may be obtained from the secretary of the National Council of Teachers of English, 506 West 69th St., Chicago, Ill.

E. L. H.

CAMPBELL, O. J. *The Value of the Ph. D. to Teachers of English,* The English Journal, XV:3. March, 1926.

The attacks upon the course of study leading to the Ph. D. have become so numerous and vigorous that Professor Campbell feels the necessity for a restatement of values. He cheerfully admits that graduate study is unable to manufacture personality, or to remove dullness and stupidity from the academic world. He denies that responsibility for the generally-condemned courses in Freshman English may properly be attached to doctors of philosophy; the scholars in the field have never believed in the "expressing-Willie" theory that dominates those courses. Even the man whose research is pretty widely divorced from his teaching has certain advantages as a teacher over the man who simply reads widely, for "a mind vigorously in pursuit of any sort of new truth becomes in many respects a better instrument than one which habitually submits itself to the control of other minds, even though they may be of the greatest." The course leading to the Ph. D. is not to be judged for its contribution to general culture; it is strictly professional training. As such, it should guarantee that the holder of the degree possesses a thorough, comprehensive, first-hand knowledge of the field he is to teach; the thesis should arouse a perennial interest in research, which tends to produce and main-

tain mental eagerness; and the scientific spirit applied even to the alien art of literature should produce in the teacher "that respect for the great, and that humility before the transcendent achievement which is the form of admiration in which the æsthetic experience begins." It is significant that Professor Campbell should admit that "the question of the actual contribution to knowledge which a thesis must make ought not to be, and is not, taken too seriously in a thesis in English literature. The important contribution is not to learning, but to the mental equipment of the candidate."

Very similar in tone to Professor Campbell's article is the discussion of scholarship and teaching in the report of President James R. Angell of Yale, for 1924-25. "The oft-discussed over-emphasis on the doctorate of philosophy and the accompanying research thesis as a *sine qua non* for entrance upon the academic career has led to much confusion of thinking. The production of a good thesis, as every one knows, is no guarantee of ability successfully to instruct college freshmen. Indeed, unless other qualifications are combined with it, it may be something of a handicap, for the atmosphere of the typical graduate school and the surroundings among which theses are produced are often utterly antipathetic to the climate of the freshman classroom. To suppose that a freshly baked doctor of philosophy is *ipso facto* equipped to teach freshmen is a tragic fallacy from which much suffering has resulted. But the contrary fallacy is, in the long run, more fatal. To imagine that a man who has the trick of enthusiasm, who is amusing and possibly often, in a way, thought-provoking to a class of callow freshmen, will continue to display even these qualities, to say nothing of any of a more substantial character, if he has not the ambition and resolution to be a scholar, is to turn one's back on oft-repeated experience, to enter into a peculiarly superfluous fool's paradise. Such men quickly run down, their jokes become stale with familiarity, the limitation of their learning presently undermines their prestige, and even their enthusiasm gradually oozes away, leaving disillusioned hacks, whose names are likely to appear for a long time on the salary rolls, but whose real value as teachers has long since passed."

E. L. H.

AIKMAN, DUNCAN, *What Babbitt Won't Talk About.* Harper's 152:911, April, 1926.

The small-town salesman or realtor is not interested in evolution, politics, the Air Service, War Debts or child labor. Orators, debaters and others please notice.

R. H. W.

ANGELL, NORMAN, *A Hint to Lecturers.* Forum, Vol. LXXV No. 4. April, '26. pp. 568-71.

The demise of the public lecture, so long prophesied, is now definitely at hand, says this well known writer and lecturer. Strangely enough, it is not the "cinema" or radio or the completely sterilized, parrotted speeches of those ill-equipped for their task which will drive the lecturer into other fields. It is the fact that the lecturer does all the talking, with the audience passive!

While one may thoroughly disagree with the diagnosis, the prescription is at least interesting. Mr. Angell suggests that the lecture become a conversation, with the audience taking the initiative by asking questions! One can see some distinct gains in genuine interest and a better quality of lecturers in the suggestion.

R. H. W.

BROOKS, GEORGE S. *Memoirs of Marionettes.* Century, Vol. 777, No. 5, March '26 pp. 513-21.

An entertaining history of the puppet show. Readers may be surprised to learn that marionettes are as old as written history. Cleopatra, Socrates, Petronius, the Emperor Muh of 1000 B. C. and other great ones of earth have been amused—and instructed—by puppets.

R. H. W.

BROOKS, WILLIAM F. *The Go-Getter Preachers & Sinclair Lewis.* McNaught's Monthly. Vol. V No. 4 p. 112. Apr. 1926.

The preacher of yesterday who visited the State Penitentiary would not have heralded his return with a flaming poster "Hargett goes to the Pen" and a red hot sermon to match; but this is mild compared with the sensational methods used today, especially in Kansas City where Sinclair Lewis is speaking in churches—and perhaps getting material for a new novel.

R. H. W.

EDMAN, IRWIN—*Reason for the Rapturous.* The Bookman. Vol. LXIII No. 7 March '26 pp 6-10.

"Reason will win its votaries when the life of reason is shown, not to be safe, but to be even more seductive than the life of passionate impulse itself." This essay is a brief plea for reason in art, based on the idea that reason (i. e. technique, thought, reflection) is pleasurable to the reasoner, not odious, or distasteful. "Sentimentalism in love and superstition in religion, the rhetorical in literature and the gaudy in painting, are made forever impossible to those whose imaginations have been tempered by reflection." Now we know at least one cause of much poor speaking and bombastic oratory.

R. H. W.

KALTENBORN, H. V. *On Being "On the Air."* Independent. Vol. 114 p. 583. May 23, 1925.

The story of a self-confessed-successful broadcaster of current events. "Any speaker with a message and a reasonably good radio voice—medium pitch, good resonance, clear enunciation can develop a huge following by regular appearances "on the air."

Mr. Kaltenborn also discusses the problems of "freedom of the air," from the standpoint of free speech. Because of his advocacy of recognition of Russia he has himself become *persona non grata* to a large broadcasting station.

The effect of the radio on improvement in voice, enunciation and pronunciation seems to have been unnoticed by most people. Mr. Kaltenborn believes that: "In the course of a few years, the radio will do much to improve the slovenly speech habits of the average American," because the radio public is becoming educated and will insist on good speech.

R. H. W.

NIEBUHR, REINHOLD—*The Rev. Silke.* Christian Century Vol. XLII No. 10. March 11, 1926. pp. 316.

An acute analysis of the rhetorical and other methods used by a highly succesful evangelical preacher of today. Mentally lazy, self-deceived, though fundamentally honest and sincere, the Rev. Dr. Silke is a success mainly as a theologico-business organizer and religious efficiency expert. His stock in trade consists of rehashing

travelogues, using sly humor and reassuring his hearers that all is going well in the world, that there is no devil and that religion and evolution can be reconciled.

"Dr. Silke preaches well . . . his words dripping with honey from many lines." Is that an essential ingredient in the recipe "How to Preach Well?"

R. H. W.

QUIDDE, LUDWIG. *Recollections of a Stutterer* (Translated from Vossiche Zeitung Dec. 20-25) Living Age Vol. 328 No. 4258 Feb. 13, '26 p. 360.

An interesting account of how a German professor, publicist and pacifist cured himself of stuttering. The method used consisted of going to a strange city, conquering the will and speaking in public a great deal.

R. H. W.

RUSSELL, BERTRAND. *Psychology and Politics.* Vol. LXXX No. 3 of The Dial pp 179-188.

"Psychology, like every other science, will place new weapons in the hands of the authorities, notably the weapons of education and propaganda, both of which may, by a more finished psychological technique, be brought to the point where they will be practically irresistible."

Mr. Russell wisely points out the fact that political opinions are not based upon reason. He illustrates this with the arguments on the gold standard (the government proposed Export Corporation might have served as well). He reminds us that the sentiments of an adult are made up of a kernel of instincts and a vast husk of education. As usual he pays his respect to education in no uncertain terms: "The essence of education is that it is a change (other than death) effected in an organism to satisfy the desires of the operator."

With this example of education before us, and with the dawning science of psycho-analysis exposing our inmost, unknown motives and complexes, Mr. Russell prophesies that politicians and authorities will seize these new weapons. Whether they will be used for the best interests of the masses or not depends entirely on the wisdom and ethics of the holders of power.

A lumpy incoherent essay, illumined by occasional, brilliant, epigrams and witty sallies, highly interesting and thought-provoking.

R. H. W.

SCOTFORD, JOHN R. *The Psychoanalyst Drops In.* The Christian Century. Vol. XLIII No. 13 pp 413-14.

What should the preacher do who has a "nicey nice manner, silly smile and ministerial twang"? After consulting his psychoanalyst, he should, according to Rev. Mr. Scotford, voice his secret beliefs, however radical they are. A good article for the suave, genial straddler who fears to offend.

R. H. W.

WALPOLE, HUGH *Reading for Fun.* The Century Vol. 777 No. 5. March 26 pp 513-21.

Do you remember 'way back when you read Robinson Crusoe up on the hay loft? Mr. Walpole traces the stages of development and varying tastes of the child-reader most interestingly. Of real value to grade teachers, story-tellers and students in story telling classes.

R. H. W.

SIMON, CLARENCE. *The Variability of Consecutive Wave Lengths in Vocal and Instrumental Sounds.* Iowa Studies in Psychology, Vol. IX, 1926. Ph. D. thesis.

In this work the author set out to accomplish two things (1) "to standardize a technique for recording and measuring sound waves"; and (2) "to gather data concerning pitch fluctuations in vocal and instrumental sounds." Relying upon the main instrument, phonelescope, to follow accurately the oscillations within the range which would be required of it, the big task was not to devise a "technique for recording" but to measure what had been recorded. That is, Simon adopted outright the photophonelescopic method of recording sound waves and then set about to invent a way to accurately measure his records. It is thought that he found an extremely reliable method for determining pitch of vocal and instrumental sounds. The usual method up to this time had been

to measure a wave of unknown frequency in terms of a wave of known frequency. Simon subsituted for the wave of constant and known frequency a known and constant passage of the film. This then permitted the actual linear measurement of a single wave, which measurement when considered as a fraction of the distance the film travelled in a second would give pitch in terms of d. v. The objectional subjective factor in reading was reduced to a minimum by reading through a microscope mounted over a vernier scale calibrated in tenths of a mm. Simon's results show that there is an exceptional agreement between different readings done by the same individual and between readings done by different individuals. The main objection to Simon's technique is that it is practicable only for a study of individual wave-by-wave fluctuatons in pitch.

The second part of the study concerns pitch fluctuations of vocal and instrumental sounds of duration of one second or under. The sounds were photographed and the wave-lengths obtained. The main findings were, first, "There are no tones of constant pitch in either vocal or instrumental sounds," and second, "The trained voices have a more marked periodicity of their fluctuations than untrained ones." Instrumental tones when produced under instruction to keep the tone constant gave o apparent periodicity in pitch fluctuation.

Not considering the advances in studying sounds which are just now coming out involving amplification, special condenser transmitters and oscillagraph vibrators, Simon's method is one of the most reliable and advanced for studying single tones.

L. E. T.

McNAMEE, GRAHAM. *You're On the Air.* Saturday Evening Post, May 1, 1926.

In this entertaining article a man whose speaking voice is doubtless known to more people than any other in history presents some side lights on speech problems before the microphone. Particularly amusing and significant is his statement that every time he mispronounces a word people all over the country rush into the mails to tell him about it. Speaking of standardizing influences in language. . . . .

J. D. Jr.

HERRICK, MARVIN T. *Joseph Trapp and the Aristotelian Catharsis.* Modern Language Notes, Vol. 41. No. 3, pp 158-163, March 1926.

Modern students and critics of the drama have generally been puzzled by Aristotle's term, Catharsis, in his definition of Tragedy. Dramatists and critics of today usually give it a pathological meaning, which is thought to be a wholly modern idea. Professor Herrick shows that, although the general tendency in the past has been to give Catharsis a moral and didactic interpretation, derived from metaphor of a religious rite of purification, there have been some as far back as the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries who have to some degree given it the "modern" interpretation. Conspicuous among these was Joseph Trapp, the first Oxford professor of poetry, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Even Trapp, however, confused the pathological significance of Catharsis with the ethical and didactic.

The article is short but scholarly and sound. It is liberally annotated and sprinkled with many interesting quotations from Milton, Dryden, Bywater, Trapp and others.

R. H. W.

Bulletin of the Institue for Research in English Teaching. Department of Education, Tokyo, Japan, August-September, 1925, New Series 17, pp. 16.

This interesting journal, edited by the phonetician H. E. Palmer, is primarily concerned with teaching the Japanese to speak English, but may profitably be consulted by other students of the spoken word as well. It contains an editorial on "The Biological Basis of English-Teaching," and an outline of a series of lectures by F. W. Brown on "Speech Psychology in its Relation to the Teaching of English in Japan," both of which emphasize speech as the basis of language, and the acoustic image as the basis of speech. A discussion in dialectic form of the question, "But What *is* Phonetics?" recalls Palmer's pamphlet, *What is Phonetics?* (London, International Phonetic Association, 1920), in its attempt to dispel some of the common misconceptions of that science.

C. K. T.

Laboratory and Research

RESEARCH PAPERS IN PROCESS OR LATELY FINISHED

Compiled by the Committee on Research

SPEECH CORRECTION AND VOICE SCIENCE

BRADFIELD, LLOYD. Comparative Irritability of Stutterers and Non-Stutterers. (Ph. D. thesis at University of Iowa, under Dr. Travis; unfinished). Irritability is being studied by means of tendon and muscle reflexes.

BRYNGELSON, BRYNG. A Study of the Articulatory Difficulties of Thirteen Stutterers. (A. M. thesis at University of Iowa, under Dr. Travis; unfinished). The stutterers were placed in numerous controlled situations which covered both propositional and repetitional speech. As a result of this study, doubt was thrown upon many of the current beliefs in regard to both the sounds and the situations which cause trouble for the stutterers.

GRAY, GILES W. The Vibrato in Speech. (Ph. D. thesis at University of Iowa, under Prof. Seashore; unfinished). The phonophotographic method is used to study pitch fluctuations within the syllable, in the expression of various moods and emotions.

CARR, ANNA M. Consonants in the Speech of College Freshmen. (A. M. thesis at University of Iowa, under supervision of Professor Sarah T. Barrows). A phonetic study and characterization of consonant sounds in the speech of two hundred freshmen in a University in the Middle West.

THOMAS, A. Z. Vowels in the Speech of College Freshmen. (A. M. thesis at University of Iowa, under supervision of Professor Sarah T. Barrows). A phonetic study and characterization of sounds in the speech of two hundred freshmen in a University in the Middle West.

WOOD, HARRY T. Measurements of Sensory and Motor Capacities of Certain Speech Defective Cases. (Ph. D. thesis at Univer-

sity of Iowa, under Dr. Travis; unfinished). Dozens of motor and sensory capacities are measured by psycho-physical methods. In addition to the group made up of speech defective cases a control group, comprising the best speakers in the freshman class, is being studied. These latter individuals will furnish norms.

DAUS, JOSEPHINE. A Study of French Intonation, Based on a Phono-photograph of a French Kymographic Record. (A. M. thesis at University of Iowa, under supervision of Professor Sarah T. Barrows coöperating with the Department of Romance Languages).

BARROWS, SARAH T. with assistance of CASE, IDA MAY. Phonetic Study of Speech of Children in Preschool. (Independent research undertaken in coöoperation with the Child Welfare Research Station, and with Dr. Bird T. Baldwin).

SPEECH COMPOSITION AND RHETORIC

GILMAN, W. E. Milton's Interest in Rhetoric. (A. M. thesis at Cornell under Professors Drummond, Cooper, Wichelns; unfinished). An attempt to trace Milton's reading in rhetoric, and his use of that reading.

HALL, A. B. Campbell's Philosophy of Rhetoric. (Ph. D. thesis at Cornell under Professors Drummond and Wichelns; unfinished.) An edition, with notes and an introduction, of the first book of Campbell's work.

HOWES, R. F. Coleridge, the talker. (A. M. thesis at University of Pittsburgh under Professors Percival Hunt and Hudson; unfinished.) An attempt to show that the constitution of Coleridge's mind and the nature of his ideas were such that he could never express himself to the best advantage in writing; that therefore his most effective means of communication was talking, and that only in his talk did his genius fully reveal itself.

KELLY, J. P. The Conception of their Art held by some Orators. (A. M. thesis at Cornell under Professors Muchmore, Wichelns, Drummond; unfinished).

WOEHL, A. L. Burke's Rhetorical Theory. (Ph. D. thesis at Cornell under Professors Drummond, Cooper, Wichelns; unfinished).

READING AND DRAMATICS

BLACKBURN, MARGARET. The Stage in St. Louis, Mo., after 1850. (A. M. thesis at University of Iowa, under Professor E. C. Mabie; unfinished).

LARRY, ETTA CYNTHIA. A Director's Prompt-book and Production of "The Tempest." (A. M. thesis at University of Iowa, under Professor E. C. Mabie; unfinished).

IRVINE, DOROTHY. Henry Irving as Actor and Director. (A. M. thesis at Cornell under Professors Drummond and Sampson; unfinished).

KEPPEL, V. J. Actors and Dramatic Critics on the Art of Oral Expression. (A. M. thesis at Cornell under Professors Drummond and Sampson; unfinished).

NEWS AND NOTES

DEPARTMENTS AND ACTIVITIES

Marquette University has announced the opening of a new School of Speech, offering opportunity for specialization in (1) Platform art, (2) Dramatic art, or (3) Speech and Debate. "All modern education," said Father Fox, President of Marquette, in making the announcement, "is placing emphasis on oral, rather than written matter. The School of Speech at Marquette was organized in response to the increasing recognition of the effect of speech training in general education, and the demand for professional training in the field on a university basis."

The new school will offer courses in virtually every phase of speech education, and will award the degree of Bachelor of Philosophy in Speech. The faculty will include William R. Duffy, who becomes Director, George H. Bost, William M. Lamers, George N. Hanley, Francis Schmidler, Elsie J. Treis, R. G. Weihe, and H. E. Ross. Nine hundred students are already taking speech courses at Marquette.

Two interesting announcements have come to us from England. A Summer School of Speech Training will be held at Oxford, in the University College Annexe, offering instruction in Voice Training, Phonetics, Public Speaking and the Delivery of Lectures, Verse Diction, Dramatic Study, and Speech Defects; and a Summer School of Drama will be held at Stratford-upon-Avon, offering courses in Voice Training, Rehearsal, Drama Study, Stage Management, Production, Playmaking, Reading and Diction. Both schools will be conducted by the Central School of Speech Training and Dramatic Art, whose work is recognized for the University of London Diploma in Dramatic Art. For further information ad-

dress the Registrar of the School, Royal Albert Hall, London, S. W. 7.

The Ithaca Conservatory announces a Program of summer Normal and Clinical Courses in Speech Correction, under Dr. Frederick Martin.

The University of Pittsburgh announces an Extension Service in Public Discussion, whereby it sends debate teams to discuss public questions wherever they may be wanted.

An Inter-collegiate Peace Association and a Junior College Debating League have been organized in Arizona. Each organization consists of the five colleges of the state: the two State Teachers' Colleges, Phoenix Junior College, Gila College, and the University of Arizona. One of the chief values of the Debating League is the experience in intensive preparation and the practice in debating which is thereby afforded the college freshmen and sophomores in the colleges of the state.

The Ohio Association of Teachers of Speech met on Friday, April 2, at Columbus, with the following program:

I—FORENSIC CONTESTS:

A—How can interest be aroused in oratorical, declamatory, and debating contests? C. R. Layton, Muskingum.

B—What should constitute a reasonable budget for debating, oratory, and declamation? H. D. Hopkins, Heidelberg.

General discussion. E. W. Miller, Wooster; D. G. Lean, Wooster; E. H. Jackson, Ohio Wesleyan; Prof. Diem, Ohio Wesleyan.

II—COLLEGE DRAMATICS:

A—What should be offered in courses of play production? R. C. Hunter, Ohio Wesleyan.

B—What should be the place and purpose of the dramatic club? Cliffe Deming, Ohio Northern.

General discussion. B. S. Leathem, Western Reserve; E. P. Johnston, Denison; W. H. Cooper, Ohio University; R. G. Bunn, Hiram; L. C. McNabb, Ohio Wesleyan.

III—PUBLIC SPEAKING CURRICULUM:

A—What should be included in a major in Public Speaking? J. T. Marshman, Ohio Wesleyan.

B—Should a teacher seek a Doctor of Philosophy in Public Speaking? C. C. Harbison, Oberlin.
General discussion. W. P. Sandford, Ohio State; S. C. VanWye, Cincinnati, H. H. Higgins, Miami.

PERSONALS

Several changes have been made in the Public Speaking staff at the University of Utah. Chauncey R. Houstman, who has been in the department for five years, is now in a San Diego High School. Joseph F. Smith, who has been on leave two years, was at the University of London last year, and is now continuing his graduate studies in the University of Illinois as well as coaching the dramatic activities there. Herbert B. Maw, also on leave is working for his Master's Degree at Northwestern University, and will go to the University of Chicago next year for his Ph. D. Esther Hill changed her name and residence last fall, and her place was taken by Hilda O. Hendrickson of the Columbia School of Oratory and the University of Wisconsin. Miss Hendrickson had been teaching several years in North Dakota and Montana. W. Prescott Dunn, of the University of Illinois, and Don C. Lewis of the University of Iowa, and Parsons College, and Harry Nelson of the University of Utah, with a year's advanced study in the University of London are now in the department.

W. M. Parrish of the University of Pittsburgh will spend the next scholastic year at Cornell University, teaching and pursuing advanced study in the Department of Public Speaking. C. K. Thomas of Cornell will join the staff in Public Speaking at the University of Pittsburgh.

E. L. Hunt will spend the summer in France, and return to Swarthmore College in the Fall.

NOTES ON PREPARING COPY
for the
QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION

(The work of the editorial staff would be greatly lightened, the appearance of the QUARTERLY improved, and the chance of error lessened, if contributors would submit their material as nearly as possible in shape for immediate publication. To assist them in doing so we note below the

principal rules and customs governing our arrangement and set-up. We hope that contributors will peruse them carefully and also observe the set-up of this and previous issues.)

Leading Articles.

1. Titles are set in 10 point caps, and centered, with short bar beneath. If possible they should be short, clear and interesting. We have been criticised for long, academic, forbidding titles. One line titles are best.

2. The author's name is set below the title in 8 point caps (on the typewriter make it lower case and double-underline). It should not be in upper corner of page or at end of article. Full name preferred. But in the interest of free and democratic discussion we omit from our pages all reference to academic titles or degrees.

3. The author's affiliation (school or college, or if he is not in school work his home city) is set below his name in 8 point lower case (ordinary lower case on the typewriter), centered, with short bar beneath.

4. No other matter should ordinarily appear at the head of the artitcle. If the article has been read at a convention an asterisk should follow the title and an appropriate foot-note state the fact.

5. Sub-titles, when used, are set in 8 point caps.

6. The text should be double-spaced (typewritten, of course, if humanly possible). It is set normally in 10 point type. For long quoted passages, poems, charts of figures, etc., 8 point is used, and may be indicated in typing by using single space. For divisions of thought larger than paragraphs and for separating inserted quotations extra spacing may be used.

7. Foot-notes (other than those referred to in Rule 4 above) are marked with superior figures and numbered consecutively from the beginning to the end of each article. In the Ms. each foot-note should be inserted immediately following the line in which it is referred to; this saves the editor and the printer work and worry. Foot-notes should be used sparingly. Some are necessary, of course, but too many kill interest.

Forum Letters.

8. Letters to the Forum are given uniform superscription and subscription as in this issue. It will save time if they are originally written to conform.

Book Reviews.

9. Reviews should be short and informative. We want the reviewer's opinion, of course, but we want his reaction to the book rather than a new book on the same subject by the reviewer.

10. Titles are set, first, in italics, running from left margin. Period after title. Then the word "By" in lower case followed by the author's

name in small caps. Then the publisher and the date in lower case, and any additional information as to editor, pages, etc. The second and succeeding lines of the citation are indented. An extra space divides the citation from the text of the review.

11. Reviewer's name at the end in small caps, and affiliation in italics.

Periodical Reviews.

12. Author's name first, in small caps, starting at left margin. Title of article next, in italics. Name of publication next, in lower case, with date.

13. Very short reviews, mere mentions, are not usually signed. Longer ones, especially if expressing opinions, are signed with initials of reviewer. Extra space between citation and text of review, as in book reviews.

General.

14. Italics may be indicated in Ms. by underlining, and small caps by double underlining. Type size may be indicated by penciled note in margin. But we use only two sizes in the regular text, 8 and 10 point. (This is 8 point.)

15. In spelling we are conservative; the New English Dictionary is our court of appeal. We recognize esthetic, equipt, etc., as legitimate variant spellings. We particularly dislike thot, tho, and thru.

16. Every reference in the text to the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION or the QUARTERLY JOURNAL is set in caps and small caps (full caps on the typewriter will do, or lower case double-underlined).

BACK NUMBERS—We have frequent calls for back numbers of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL, especially Volume I, No. 1, and Volume V, Nos. 2 and 3. Several libraries and individuals stand ready to pay a premium for copies of these issues.